

College

at

Journal

WINTER • 1949-50

VOLUME IX • NUMBER 2



Viktor Schreckengost—Pictures at an Exhibition
Courtesy Cleveland Institute of Art

college art journal

A PUBLICATION OF THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

CONTENTS	PAGE
Modern Art and the Philosopher (<i>Rbys Carpenter</i>)	115
Iconolatry and Iconoclasm (<i>Nicolas Calas</i>)	129
Orozco, Genius of America (<i>Justino Fernández</i>)	142
Orozco's Stylistic Evolution (<i>Jean Charlot</i>)	148
Historical Art and Contemporary Art (<i>Jesse Garrison</i>)	158
College Fine Arts Today (<i>Alden F. Megrew</i>)	168
The Correlation of Literature and the Fine Arts (<i>Blanche R. Brown</i>)	176
The Correlation of Literature with Architecture (<i>Francis Shoemaker</i>)	181
The Training of Personnel for General Museum Work (<i>Edgar C. Schenck</i>)	187
Historical Survey of the Activities of the Intelligence Department, MFA & A Section, OMGB, 1946- 1949 (<i>Edgar Breitenbach</i>)	192
Contemporary Documents	
I Teach Fundamentals (George Grosz), 199, Revolution in Printmaking (Adolf Dehn), 201; On Technical Processes in Printmaking (<i>Mauricio Lasansky</i>), 203; Craftsmanship, Print- making, and Contemporary Education (<i>Harry Sternberg</i>), 204.	
Obituaries	
Arthur Pillans Laurie (<i>Edward W. Forbes</i>), 206; Wolfgang Born (<i>Ralph L. Wickiser</i>), 208; Mehmet Aga-Oglu (<i>Maurice S. Dimand</i>), 208.	
News Report	210
Book Reviews	224
Books Received	238

Volume IX

WINTER 1949-50

Number 2

Editor: LAURENCE SCHMECKEBIER, Cleveland Institute of Art,
11441 Juniper Rd., Cleveland 6, Ohio. Editor for Book Reviews:
ALLEN S. WELLER, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. News Editor:
HELEN FOSS (Mrs. E. D.), Box 315, Flora, Ill.

THE COLLEGE ART JOURNAL is published quarterly by the College
Art Association of America at 625 Madison Ave., New York 22,
N.Y. Two dollars a year; single nos. fifty cents. Entered as
second-class matter at the Post Office in New York, N.Y., under
the act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Menasha, Wis.



*
*
*
*
*
*
*

CONSTANTINE KERMES, *Shaker Woman*
Courtesy Jacques Seligmann Galleries

MODERN ART AND THE PHILOSOPHER¹

By Rhys Carpenter

THE stirring Latin phrase *sub specie aeternitatis* may fitly be applied to the astronomer's all-but-infinite mental vision, while the geologist with his multi-millennial outlook very nearly earns it; and in consequence neither of these can bring human history into his focus. At the other end of the optometric scale is the myopia of the journalist and columnist and pragmatic philosopher; while somewhere in the middle stands the archaeologist, with focus close enough to glimpse human behavior, but with perspective ample enough to deserve the only slightly less noble epithet *sub specie saeculorum*. It is true that the archaeologist often succumbs to what one might call a lenticular fever, during which he keeps his eyes glued to the glasses through which he makes his minute detections of a trivial and unimportant past. In this pose he is as easily derided for his enthrallment with broken pots as the chemist by the English schoolboy for his unbroken stinks; but like the chemist who rises above his smell, the archaeologist will enjoy wider opportunities when he looks up from his pots. If he tries to make use of his vision *sub specie saeculorum*, the perspective which he has brought to the past may help others to see the present.

If I may be permitted a very personal approach, I shall admit that, as a result of professional archaeological preoccupations, I suffer from an irremediable bias of perspective on almost all aesthetic problems, a sort of gigantic parallax rather than astigmatism, which makes it impossible for me to see the present except as a momentary point of passage on a line extending out of the remotest past into an immediate future. So extraordinary a manifestation as twentieth century Western Painting, during that century's completed half, seems to have for its most striking common quality a determination to break completely with every past tradition; yet for me it is intelligible only when it is fitted without discontinuity into the perspective of its own previous career.

In explaining such a paradox, I trust that I shall not automatically be relegated to the eighteenth century if I begin by saying that the visual arts

¹ Based on an address delivered at the annual banquet of the American Society for Aesthetics at Oberlin College on Oct. 21, 1949.

must imitate natural forms and appearances, and that the acquisition of the technique of adequate imitation of nature has been the major compelling force on long generations of artists in all civilizations which have made much progress with art (even Egyptian sculpture and painting being no exception to this statement). This may seem pure dogma to those who hold that art need not be imitative; yet it cannot be disregarded as an outmoded prejudice, since, historically considered as an actual event in the past, visual art has always been predominantly imitative of the objective world of sense—no matter what else it may *also* have been.

Every imitative art must go through a technical evolution if it sets itself an imitative task which it cannot easily and instantly achieve. Thus the drama, in so far as it chooses to reproduce the behavior of a world of human beings, will undergo a technical evolution from more or less symbolic mummerly through pageantry of the miracle-play type to imitative presentation of generic-character types which, as they ever more closely copy the behavior and speech of real human beings, will move from the permissible discrepancies of the distant and imaginary characters of legend and romance toward the realistic persons of a comedy-of-manners reproducing the audience's own contemporary world of people. With that attainment, it will have achieved its objective of accurate *mimesis* and, losing thereby an obvious and dominant direction for its progress, it will be destined to enter on a "time of troubles" while it searches for new forms and new effects.

It is a purely physical (or perhaps physiological) accident that it is so extremely difficult for men to discover how to put with pigment on a flat surface what the camera loaded with a kodachrome film records in a split second of exposure. Were this not so, the whole history of painting would have been not merely utterly, but unrecognizably, different. Since it *is* so, generations of industrious, ambitious and ingenious painters must intervene between Cimabue and Constable, even as a similar and roughly equidistant sequence of generations separates Polygnotos from the illusionistic realists of the Roman Empire. That the acquisition of a technique of imitative realism has been the dominant formative trend of Greco-Roman, of Chinese, and of West European painting ought not to be denied by any one, because it is capable of as precise, as full, and as material proof as anything in natural history or science. To deny it, is simply to say that something is not so, which can be shown and proved to be true. Any repugnance to admitting its actuality is usually based on the misapprehension that the exponent of technical determinism is somehow trying to deny spiritual and aesthetic values to the individual paintings or the painters who produced them—

which is, of course, idiotic enough to make anybody angry, including the technical determinist himself.

Just as the final stage in mimetic evolution may be identified for drama as the realistic portrayal of contemporary manners—a phase which without intentional witticism is often called the comedy of manners, though only God and the inveterate cynic may be trusted to discover anything comic in the everyday utterance and action of men, and such an uncomic and unhumorous bore as Ibsen supplies with his commonplace minor characters our best exemplification of the technique—so the logical final stage of mimetic evolution for painting and for sculpture can be identified with equal precision; and it is an interesting proof of the independence of these arts from their sociological and cultural environment (of which, in most people's minds, they are considered inevitably to be the reflection) that these mimetic end-points are not reached synchronously by all the various arts, but each arrives there at its own proper evolutionary moment. To choose an example discreetly from a past too distant for present irritation, in classic Greece we may watch the drama outstrip the other visual arts and run its cycle in hardly more than two hundred years. The period is determinable because choral mummers dance just behind Aeschylus' birth in the late sixth century B.C., and a speaker steps out from their ranks to be the first and sole actor even within his lifetime. In Aeschylus himself, we see the pure pageantry of his *Suppliants* and the nascent dramatic contrasts of his *Persians* mature to the heroic legend mimed as true tragedy in his *Agamemnon*. Sophocles completely humanizes the tragic types, but still keeps them temporally aloof in the land of legend. With Euripides we find even the legendary folk modernized into ordinary human beings, and see the beginnings of romantic comedy in his *Tauric Iphigenia*. Aristophanes, though he gives us the whimsical fairy comedy of the *Birds*, yet is more inclined to present actual Athenians in some preposterous medley of reality and buffoonery. After him comes the New Comedy; and by 300 B.C. Menander is showing everyday people in the complications of everyday life amid the houses and streets of a contemporary Grecian society. And that, for Greek literature, is the end.

Sculpture develops more slowly; for the chisel and the casting-mould make it a slower and more costly practice than pen and paper and the training of choruses. Yet its ambition is obviously possible to attain and (to those who have not sufficiently grasped its obstacles) may even seem an easy task, since sculpture may imitate at full scale and in solid actuality. It is therefore a truly imitative art since in the crude physical sense, at least, it reproduces rather than transfigures actuality. In Greece, monumental sculpture

began its career around 625 B.C. when Egypt was opened to the Greek visitor. Half a thousand years later—twice the space of time which drama demanded—every muscle of the human body in every attitude of strain and rest could be reproduced by the sculptor, and any human face could be made to reappear in bronze which had been cast from modelled wax—to the extreme satisfaction of the Roman patron who could conceive of no more desirable purpose for the artist's adroitness of imitation.

Painting moves faster than sculpture because it can be produced so much more quickly and cheaply; yet it has farther to go, because it sets itself the vastly more intricate task of recreating on a two-dimensional surface the illusion of a three-dimensional world, so that, with no regard for the actual size of objects, it must make a most cunning calculation of their relative scale, and must re-adjust everything out to the farthest horizon of sight in order to set it down at the same actual distance from the spectator's eye; and then there is foreshortening, and light and cast-shadow—but why be tedious in enumerating all the formidable difficulties, just because the accomplishment I am discussing has proved so tedious of attainment to its practitioners? Perhaps the final goal is actually unattainable, in the sense that a landscape or a painted portrait can never be co-equal with nature to the same extent that a piece of tinted marble can be co-equal to a human body; but this is not as significant an observation as it might be made to sound, because the physically attainable limit becomes the stopping-point just as decisively as would have the logically final goal of perfect mimicry. By the second century after Christ, the classical painters achieved realistic illusionism and impressionism and even expressionism—and there the art was obliged to rest and hold itself in check until a transcendental religion gave it new objectives by insisting that visual appearances were important only as symbols of the unseen, so that mimetic realism rather suddenly ceased to be desired, because it could only reproduce a sensuous world to which all real value had been denied.

Architecture moves so slowly, with the bulk and costliness of its product and the comparative scarcity of major commissions, that I am content to think that the whole of Greek architecture occupies only the decorated flatland of archaism, and that it is not until the last of the Roman Empire that an adequate comprehension of three-dimensional spatial forms brings in the art's maturity. However, architecture properly is not a mimetic art at all; and I mention it only to elaborate my point that each of the arts has its own conditioned rate of growth, and consequently all the arts together neither will nor can move temporally in step in their evolution.

Yet here is an interesting minor contribution to the inter-relationship of the arts: a major art can exercise a strong retarding or accelerating influence on another art which is not so powerfully to the fore in the general cultural consciousness. For reasons which I can only guess at, the classical Greek mentality made sculpture its major and painting its minor art, whereas the West European mind reversed this and gave to painting the major and to sculpture the minor place in its esteem. As an immediate consequence, Greek painting was dominated by a sculptural sense which made it almost unnaturally sensitive to the contours of the human body and neglectful of such all-important but non-sculptural subject-matters as landscape and inorganic accessories of composition. An exactly contrary influence shows in the deplorable Renaissance craving to make reliefs into carved paintings with perspective and all the non-sculptural accessories of the painted scene.

Again, European Baroque architecture is baroque mainly under contemporary pictorial influence rather than in its own right of exploiting essentially architectural forms; for it displays mainly pictorial devices such as false linear perspective and illusionistic ornament in the flat. For a baroque phase in properly architectural terms we shall have to wait for modern Barcelona's more weird than wonderful *Templo de la Sagrada Familia* or the equally extravagant but sometimes much more thoughtful creations in free architectural forms which the best contemporary architecture offers—even though its designers (thinking that Baroque can only mean a past historical period) would probably be indignant if informed that theirs, and not the productions by Bernini or Borromini, are morphologically the true baroque architecture.

The lesser arts can survive, because they can recover from these externally induced aberrations. In classical antiquity the technical evolution of painting was not arrested when sculpture, which had so tyrannized its behavior, went into collapse about the year 100 B.C. In modern times, architecture survived the violent but superficial enticements of seventeenth century painting—though rather naturally it had to purge itself by revivifying its past with a neo-classic and neo-Gothic retreat, before it could resume its proper progress. But when the major art of a civilization reaches its final mimetic phase and finds its century-long trend arrested and further movement blocked, then a major "time of troubles" must ensue. Greek sculpture was saved from the utter disintegration upon which it entered in the opening decades of the first century B.C., only by the wholly fortuitous accident that the new Roman state, which had become all-powerful politically and economically, also chanced to be so tremendously impressed by Greek art.

In consequence, a new but artificial stimulus was given to the Greek sculptors to produce for the Romans more or less what they had exhausted every native stimulus for producing for themselves. Yet little of real importance resulted.

For Western Europe the "time of troubles" did not come with sculpture's attainment of its final mimetic phase early in the seventeenth century, for painting was the major interest and still had a couple of centuries of technical evolution ahead of it. But when painting's final mimetic phase was attained by the French Illusionists of the latter nineteenth century, a general "time of troubles" for all arts was inescapably at hand. I look on all that has happened since, with its amazingly diversified but not very amazingly productive revolution against the Great Tradition of the preceding six centuries from A.D. 1300 to A.D. 1900—or, as I might randomly put it, from Giotto to "Blotto,"—I look on all this recent output of energy as pure experimentation in search of some universally convincing answer to the very simple and entirely natural question: If art is not to be based on imitation, on what is it to be based? If painting cannot any longer express itself through direct mimesis of natural appearances, through what can it express itself?

The first answers offered by the painters to this fundamental question were, as might have been expected, elementary in their crudeness. Casting about for non-mimetic forms into which to recast visual appearances, some appealed to basic geometrical forms, cubes, squares, triangles,—without any accompanying intellectual clarification on the reason why an enhancement of esthetic purpose should attend on the earlier rather than the later pages of Euclid. Others foresook form for color and rode like Kandinsky's *Blauer Reiter* into a seething kettle of aniline. It was more logical, perhaps, to go the whole way into "a-mimetic noësis" and to abstract all recognizable visual content from the colored shapes which, quite correctly, were taken to be the painter's *materia prima*. The only logical error here was not to recognize the *reductio ad absurdum* (a very noble and courageous form of proof!) when it had been reached.

Extremely interesting both logically and psychologically is the Surrealist compromise by which, while mimetic fidelity is accepted as art's province, a complete and apparently arbitrary re-arrangement of the world's visual content is asserted for its especial prerogative, so that the physically impossible (and in this sense irrational) can become the emotionally significant. This is, by all odds, the cleverest way to accept the camera's challenge of photographic accuracy, yet utterly frustrate all mechanical competition

with painting. And certainly, the latent assertion that the painter can freely abandon to the color-film the everyday world before the eye and devote himself to a pictorial evocation of a new world whose sanction is behind the eye, does supply one possible and logically unassailable answer to our question: If art is not to be based on imitation, on what is it to be based? Incidentally, it should be underscored that, though Sur-realism pretends to make use of subconscious associational traits and categories, there is no question of photographically reproducing visions of the Unconscious or any similarly elusive factor in human personality. The subconscious, by definition, is not visible.

It seems to me aesthetically significant, indeed enormously important, that contemporary art's fundamental query is the first of its kind that has been asked since the Early Christian centuries offered their transcendental solution to the same dilemma. By "first of its kind" I mean that the question and its underlying problem are not technical in category, not incident to the artist's basic task of discovering how to reduce the world of natural appearances to pigments on a flat surface. On the contrary, contemporary art's problem is psychologic in its field of reference, sociologic in its scope, and metaphysical in its implications; in short, it is not a question for the artists themselves to answer in an immediate practical way or through the accepted resources of their own traditional craft. It is an aesthetic question that belongs to the aesthetician to answer if he can, or if he cannot answer, at least to debate and consider.

Yet the trouble at present lies precisely here—that it is not the aesthetician but the artist who is trying to answer it; and the artist belongs temperamentally to the class of those least fitted to do so. There is no way to prevent an artist from trying to think or from proclaiming his ideas to anyone who will listen to him. Most of us would explode if we were not allowed to converse, write, lecture, orate, criticize, instruct, inform and, above all, merely *talk*; and there is no reason why the artist should be exempt from this need—except in so far as he can relieve himself by painting as well as by talking (which is more than his critics can do).

But in the past, such artist-talk has done comparatively little mischief, since only a few artists have ever changed their way of painting because of their way of talking—(it actually works the other way round)—and the few who did so were usually better talkers than painters.

Perhaps there are those who will disagree with me; but what artists have had to say about art—including such excellent conversationalists as Whistler and Rodin—seems to me of practically no importance whatever

when measured against art itself. And how completely the range of such talk lies within the boundaries of the particular evolutionary phase which has been reached by the arts which are being practiced, will be illuminatingly apparent to anyone who reads *Vasari* with this in mind,—or Rodin, or Whistler.

Artists are like a couple of friends who go for a walk in the forest and fall so busily to conversing that they do not notice where they are going. If the forest were a jungle, this would be a serious matter; but with the pleasant and familiar path already laid out for them, the path takes them through the forest and up the slope past the summer-house and then down around the little lake and so back home; and as far as the walk is concerned, it does not matter in the least what they were talking about or how excited they got or how long they stopped for argument—in due course of time, they will reappear across the lake and in another ten minutes will be home. But now, for the first time the forest *is* a jungle; and the artists will have to cut a new path, not merely follow an old one, with the entirely natural result that they are going to get lost daily, hourly, and all the time. For now they will have to argue about the path itself, how to make it, where to turn it, and whither it is to lead; and that is a very different sort of argument, for which they have neither training nor aptitude.

The philosopher of art, I am glad to see, is not unaware either of the artist's predicament or of his own unrivalled opportunity. In the old days, when the artist knew where he was going, the scholars and aestheticians danced a sort of distant attendance on him, chanting songs about the Good, the Beautiful, the True; or, like Lessing, they tried to deduce rules as to which arts should imitate how much of what, and why. We have thrown all that overboard and proclaimed the artist utterly free to do as he likes: he is bound to no beauty; there is no aesthetic parade-ground within which he must march; there are no pre-existent aesthetic values to which he must conform, but only those which he himself calls into existence by doing whatever he considers effective. And today, to justify this new proclamation of liberty, he finds himself in dire need of help in finding some compensating restraint to direct his behavior. It is a curious thing that freedom is always presented to us as something very positive—as, for example, freedom from want, freedom from having to earn our living by our own unguided enterprise, freedom from fear (including the fear we may have to work)—and yet it usually turns out to be a negative asset in a new and concealed kind of commitment. The great difficulty for the artist today is precisely that he enjoys utter and absolute freedom—freedom to express him-

self, whatever that may mean (and if left without further qualification, it has been proving to most of us that it does not mean very much of anything)—in a word, freedom to get hopelessly lost. Viewed in this way, modern art is the scholar's and philosopher's problem.

The public, having sensed that traditional art has ended, has succumbed to the easy snobbery of an attitude of superiority to all the old-timers. But having no inkling *why* the old-timers belong to an irrevocable past or who and what should take their places, they are peculiarly vulnerable to any self-assured jargon which gives them a formula or a pattern for the new. Because, as the Oxford undergraduate said in his maiden speech at the Oxford Union, any stigma will do to beat a dogma, they reject the old for a slur or a sneer—which in view of its magnificent record of half a thousand years it certainly does not merit—and accept the most ridiculous nonsense or impudence as significant and real. In a characteristically human way, the man in the street lacks courage when it comes to reversing his old favorite palliative for ignorance, and hesitates to assert that he may not know much about art, but he knows what he *doesn't* like!

Let us encourage him to be outspoken, to be like the child in Hans Andersen's immortal parable who, when the beduped emperor serenely paraded through the crowded streets of his capital city with nothing at all upon his bare body, amid the oh's and ah's and "what wonderful clothes the emperor is wearing!", alone of all that company blurted out, "Why, he hasn't a stitch on him!" Let us, as scholars and philosophers of art be honest along with the child, and not side with the ashamed onlookers who dare not confess what they see. Let us explain to the public what is really going on,—how naked many of the parading artists are; how much of what they do is mere fumbling, experimentation, trial-and-error, where the odds are all for error, and the trial is of our own patience.

Let us be the first to say that artists have a right to talk aloud, even though much of what they say cannot possibly make sense; but let us also insist that what is going on is a marvellous attempt to do something that art has never consciously tried to do before in man's history. Let us, as trained thinkers in art, help the public to think, and let us prevent it from being led by a nose that is too long even to be classed as a proboscis. Ours is an enthusiastic but ignorant nation, and a little honest intellectual enlightenment would be a great good deed against the barrage of commercialized ballyhoo from which it is forced to learn all that it thinks it knows.

And if it be objected that modern artists have already suffered aplenty from the jeers of the unsympathetic who do not even attempt to under-

stand what they are doing, my reply still must be that we must have honesty first, and only then understanding will follow. A better comprehension of modern art is bound to result from less pretense and more frankness, less self-deception, less market-wise encouragement to impertinence. If instead of generally muddled theorizing, obfuscation with jargon clichés, tongue-in-cheek pronouncements, and shallow profundities, everyone laid the cards on the table with the open admission that the game was very difficult and the method of play obscure, the vast improvement in the general comprehension of the significance of the modern artistic revolution would do much to fortify and protect the contemporary artist against the discouraging jibes of those who (not necessarily philistine in temper, so much as baffled and irritated) at present make small sense out of his work because they interpret it literally and photographically. And here the fault is not invariably with the artists, whose business is not to philosophize, but with the aestheticians who have failed to clarify the situation, identify the specific problems, and evaluate the tentative solutions.

Having previously attained an apparent limit in the technique of realistically reproducing the spatial world of appearances in a two-dimensional translation, painting in the present half-century has made the crucial advance of refusing to be restricted, like the camera, to a recording of actual visual events *from a fixed viewpoint*. This restriction, so tyrannously imposed on previous painting, was an artificial restraint incident to the very ideal of visual fidelity which artists could not help cherishing. When Mantegna foreshortened bodies and converged architectural lines to a vanishing-point, this "scientific" correcting of perspective already foreordained the goal of photographic realism. Modern art's nostalgia for the primitive (a natural enlargement of the concept behind "Pre-Raphaelism") is little else than a longing to resume the long-lost pre-scientific freedom of visual recording. But in actualizing an escape from the corporeal environment of everyday personal vision, it is as unnecessary as it is foolish to adopt the immature modes of primitivism.

That painting is not, and spiritually cannot be, restricted with the camera and other mechanical reproductive devices to recording only actual events from fixed viewpoints, is a vital discovery. The exploitation of the freedom which this confers is a vital matter. The escape from visual spatial realism will be futile if it leads to nothing but dissolution into incoherence. It will be effective for the future of painting only if this novel emancipation from physical space and time is used as a constructive contributory element in a more highly organized spiritual experience. In the jargon of the philos-

ophers who talk about "levels" of organization, the escape should mark an advance to a higher, and not a recession to a lower, level of consciousness. And here, in my opinion, modern art has had its chief difficulty and made its worst mistake, as I shall try to explain a little later on.

There should be no feeling of lack of sympathy, hostile criticism, or reactionary reproach when a scholar or critic asserts that contemporary art is in a purely experimental stage and that most of its efforts hitherto have been failures, except as experiments in the long process of trial and error. How intellectual a practice modern art has been, may be seen from the number of "manifestoes," "programmes," and other pronouncements with which new movements have been launched. How unintellectual a practice it has been may be discovered by reading these same documents, most of which are rhetorical enough, but philosophically are devoid of sense. That modern art is rightly intellectual, I have been emphasizing; but this may incidentally be its most fundamental weakness. The evolution of art can always be *apprehended* intellectually; but that art today presents itself intellectually even to the artists themselves, during the very act of their production of it, may indicate the lack of any more intuitive solution such as, in the past, religion has more than once afforded. There seems to be no comparable informing force today. A certain amount of iconoclastic emotion has been released through class-resentment, because of a rather unclear tendency to identify traditional techniques with the capitalist bourgeoisie; but I do not think that this has thus far made any very evident constructive contribution.

If modern art is thus destined to be basically an intellectual revolution, no one should resent, but on the contrary welcome as necessary and valuable, every attempt to point out *why* its innumerable failures have been failures, and what it is that so many utterly diverse experiments may be considered to prove or disprove.

Thus, the cardinal expectation of Expressionism that an unactualized emotional range can be visually presented (or perhaps one should say, re-created through visual appearances) by means of less choate colored shapes than those that we normally perceive, was fallacious because it confused categories of experience, because it tried to present a lower-level activity in terms of a higher-level process. It is doomed to failure not because it is "in-artistic" (a term which I should not like to have to define), but because mechanically it will not work. The communication of emotions without the intervention of a specific visual embodiment is an exciting and wonderful idea; but if it doesn't work, it doesn't work. And presumably there is a

perfectly adequate reason *why* it doesn't work; and this is the aesthetician's function to discover.

The modern discovery of the subliminal self and the domain of the subconscious has had repercussions among an unbelievably wide public and has had an extraordinary influence—for the most part incoherent, uncritical, and even mistaken—on the popular intelligence. To this the intellectualizing artists have been no more immune than the rest of the lay public. It had, indeed, a very special appeal to them because they were searching for a direction of escape from photographic realism, and the new Subconscious seemed to be a central realm of basic emotional import. Here were the darkly buried roots beneath the growing tree of universal human behavior. Out of the instinctive urge of sex and hunger and egoism,—all of them basic, primitive and elemental—came the chief driving forces of human life, only to be weakened, diverted, repressed, disintegrated into the uninteresting uniformity of everyday social existence. Art—which had always transcended the everyday commonplace in search of something universal, generic, even supersensual, and charged with emotion—saw its *locus operandi* suddenly identified, scientifically defined, and made directly available for artistic exploitation.

How does man reach the subliminal; how does he become conscious of his own unconscious? By hypnosis, in dreams, and in the waking state by "free association." To all three of these experiences there attaches considerable vagueness as compared with normal conscious life; and since it is proper to them, such vagueness reappears in every appeal to them or use of them in art or literature. Yet, since art is a material thing, whether of painted surface or shaped mineral substance or type-printed page, the work of art has to be materially specific; and how in material form to "specify vagueness" becomes a challenging task. Sculpture, being spatially as well as visually mimetic, has had the greatest difficulty in finding a workable solution to such a problem and, if for that reason alone, will probably not succumb very deeply or for very long to the temptation to draw on the unconscious for its highly self-conscious medium.

On the other hand poetry, being almost entirely cerebral (since almost nothing of it exists materially on the printed page, but must be re-interpreted into significant sound), has had the most apparent (and hence, I hold, the most spurious) success with this experiment. When T. S. Eliot writes of a victory parade in Paris:

"Stone, bronze, stone, steel, stone, oakleaves, horses' heels
Over the paving.

That is all we could see. But how many eagles! and how many trumpets!

(And Easter Day, we didn't get to the country,
So we took young Cyril to church. And they rang a bell
And he said right out loud, *crumpets*.)

Don't throw away that sausage,

It'll come in handy. He's artful. Please, will you

Give us a light?

Light

Light

Et les soldats faisaient la baie? ILS LA FAISAIENT."

he aims through a seemingly irrelevant discontinuity to recreate the semi-conscious flux of undirected sentiency in a mind not functionally in focus—which sounds like a formidable achievement, but poetically remains at a level at which poetry can hardly be said to have begun to operate. This is the same realm which some modern painting hopes to present in visual (instead of, as in Eliot, by mediating verbal) terms. Even if it could do so, like Eliot's lines, it would be moving at the wrong level for the medium.

The fallacy here involved seems to me apparent. It lies in an arbitrary identification of the *supersensuous* element, which we all know is somehow present in art, with the *subsensuous* of Freudian analysis. Anyone who has experimented with a Ouidja board or automatic writing or spirit communication, or has seriously reviewed the contents of his own dreams, must have been struck by the utter triviality and lack of deeper significance of anything that has thus been fished up out of the depths. At these full fathoms five, there seems to lie neither coral nor pearl. However much they may influence our behavior, the Freudian elements in consciousness are not of interest or importance except as they assert themselves at a higher conscious level—at which level they become something entirely different by recombination in the conscious environment, having therewith emerged from the more nearly physiological stratum.

It is not the subconscious as such, but the way in which it participates in the organization of conscious experience, which makes it humanly significant. By forsaking the level of mental intensity at which art emerges, "free association" art does not reach an art behind more ordinary art or emotionally beneath it; it has merely failed to produce art. However, as I noted before, Sur-realism ingeniously avoids this error. Where free-associative poetry seeks to use a level where speech is only half-articulate, Dalí reverts to the subconscious world of dreams and impulses for subject matter and claims permission to abandon the material coherences of the seen world of fully-conscious experience, but paints the individual elements thus assembled, as clearly and intelligibly *as though* they were experienced at the highest level

of cognitive attention. This is precisely what Coleridge has done in *Kubla Khan*, and T. S. Eliot has *not* done in *Waste Land*.

If one can believe—as I personally am prepared to do—that Mind (and with it, Soul or Spirit) characterizes the level at which Matter has become complexly organized enough to attain conscious knowledge of itself, that this attainment has been a tediously long historical process stretching back through the whole of life's evolution on this planet, and finally that art does not emerge before a comparatively high level has been evolved, then it is sheer perversity to depress art to un-self-consciousness, to try to make it work its magic at less fully organized levels to which it does not characteristically belong and at which, historically, it has not been capable of emerging. The Ouija board does not write creative poetry; the spiritualist seances do not evoke sound philosophy; dreams, unless they borrow directly from prior creations of the waking mind, do not create art, either oral or visual; and the Freudian impulses of sex have to be sublimated before they are anything more cogent than sex impulses. In short, it is as much a fallacy to say that art lies beneath consciousness in available form as a great primitive and vital Unknown, hitherto unseen but waiting to be unveiled, as it was to talk about a Golden Age somewhere in our past, or to yearn for the unspoiled simplicity of Primitive Man and the Noble Savage, or to foster the unsophisticated power of self-expression in children and uncivilized societies.

It is all part and parcel of the same widespread fallacy, which might perhaps be termed the *De Profundis* fallacy, of descending to spiritual, mental, physiological, or historically temporal levels from which mature man has successfully (I am evolutionary optimist enough to say, triumphantly) emerged. There is no such thing as unselfconscious art because art does not exist at unselfconscious levels. Abstract visual art is not art because its forms, though entirely genuine as artistic forms, are unsublimated by fusion with the world of sensuous experience and therefore are moving at the wrong cognitive level. They are no more art than Freudian sex-impulse is love, and for much the same reason. They are not profounder than traditional art, or greater than traditional art, any more than a sex-impulse, whether yielded to or suppressed, is greater than *Tristan and Isolde*. And the sooner we all know these things and admit them, the better.

ICONOLATRY AND ICONOCLASM

By Nicolas Calas

OUR admiration for the beauty of geometric designs on ancient pottery must not obscure the fact that these patterns are sometimes neolithic expressions of mathematical calculations, and often mark an attempt to develop triangular numbers that were later to become so important in Pythagorean mathematics.¹ On the other hand the importance of contemporary mathematical calculation must not lead us to neglect the aesthetic qualities of this most abstract of sciences.

Already in the beginning of the century, to the surprise of the savants of his day, the great Henri Poincaré² spoke of the beauty, elegance and harmony of mathematics. Poincaré claimed that mathematical invention implies an ability to discern and select among mathematical constructions the very limited number that can be of actual use and does not consist in employing already known figures to make new combinations, for that, he said, any one can do, and general calculations made on this basis are very often useless. Elaborating on this theme, K. Koffka says, in his already classical work *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*,³ in a passage obviously influenced by the ideas of Henri Poincaré: "The present day physicist . . . will not measure anything and everything, but only such effects as in some way or other contribute to his theory. . . . A mere connection of numbers is never what the physicist wants. This is a theory of order and totals and wholes." No wonder, therefore, that the Constructivist school of art and more particularly Naomi Gabo, should be led to believe that the role of the modern artist is to 'prefigure' forms that mathematics and applied science will eventually adopt.

When viewed in the light of this structural theory the traditional distinction between the type of person, described as artistic or poetic, and the type described as scientific, must be abandoned as the latter appears to be actually a certain kind of artist having in common with other artists a sensitivity to the pattern of his work.

¹ Dirk J. Struik, "Stone Age of Mathematics," *American Scientific* (December, 1948).

² Henri Poincaré, "L'invention Mathématique" *L'enquête sur l'enseignement mathématique* (Paris, 1912).

³ K. Koffka, *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*, (New York, 1935), p. 13.

When our attention in art is focused on patterns, whether neolithic and geometric, or post-Euclidian and "abstract," the artist's ability to elaborate becomes more important than his inspiration. We will then evaluate artistic temperament on the individual propensity to respond to the pattern-making demands of his culture. Such a criterion for judging artistic production is taken for granted by the Balinese. According to Margaret Mead, man there has so shaped culture "that there is a symbolic answer for every need which is patterned in the growing child. The young child may be taught to know error and frustration, bitterness or rejection and cruel loneliness of spirit very young, and yet grow up to be a gay and very lightfooted adult, because for every tension of the threads that have been twisted in the delicate mesh of the child's spirit the culture has a symbolic relation ready."⁴

The pattern theory helps to account for adaptation achieved through canalization of human energy into the grooves of a culturally determined pattern. But if the artist repeats an accepted pattern of behavior by following the footsteps of his predecessors, his work will, in turn, be a repetition or imitation of the pattern of an earlier work. The question is, can art be reduced to the point where it is comprehended as a repetition, or imitation of preexisting patterns? If so, all artists who do not conform and follow accepted patterns are doomed to be rejected by their society unless, by tracing deviations from tradition to other sets of patterns, the critic could explain away originality and prove the deviant artist to be less maladjusted to his culture than believed at first view.

Perhaps in totalitarian states the function of the critic should be to prove that the artists he admires are not guilty of deviations and heresy, but in a democratic regime the Balinese prototype cannot and should not serve as model for artistic activity. According to the Western conception of art the basic problem is not whether the originality of a work can be accounted for by an increased amount of erudition and deeper insight but whether a work of art can be appreciated for its originality. The reason for singling out certain works and distinguishing them from the mass of other works stems from the conviction that uniqueness is valuable. Hence the importance to elaborate a method of research by means of which originality can be appraised. This objective is achieved by the historical method which purposes to retrace the particular circumstances which led to the formation of a unique being or a unique work. Obviously in a historical investigation not all past steps need be taken into account, but only those which appear to have had a decisive effect on the formation of the artist or his work.

⁴M. Mead, "The Arts in Bali," *Yale Review* (Winter, 1941).

The spirit of the child and potential artist can never be compared, when viewed from the historical angle, with a yarn whose threads are twisted and double woven into the web of existence, for existence is an assortment of threads often so hopelessly entangled that knots will prevent the spirit from ever weaving its existence into a harmonious pattern. Only he who is gifted with the *sense of history* is able to interpret the existence of an individual, a nation, or a culture in relation to its "becoming." Instead of a theory of threads, or isolated traits by which adaptation to cultural patterns is explained, one needs a theory of Gordian knots which will account for un-overcome obstacles and "not becoming." If the theory of sublimation throws so much light on the process of artistic creation, it is because it enables one to account for originality in terms of the psychological crises that lead to the formation of the artistic temperament.

He who only imitates and repeats what his predecessors have done is not an artist but a skilled craftsman. One can never hope to understand the spirit of Greek art simply by affirming that potters imitated triangular numbers; we need to understand how they became conscious of the geometric order. Sociologically, the sense of geometry is probably preconditioned by economic life, and more particularly by the development of horticulture which, under a regime of private property, leads to the division of the land into geometric patterns, but psychologically the awareness of geometric patterns corresponds to a situation in which the individual becomes conscious of the value of totals and wholes.

According to Spengler⁵ geometric space corresponds to Euclidean geometry and classical art, as expressed by sculpture; while to its opposite, the spirit of infinity, corresponds to Gothic architecture, infinitesimal calculus and Baroque music. Elaborating on this theme the author of the *Decline of the West* remarks that, while the Greeks adopted an "Apollonian" attitude, ignored solitude and remained always aware of the omnipresence of space, the Gothic artists and the moderns adopted a "Faustian" attitude which made them conscious of the presence of infinity apprehended as a consequence of loneliness.

On the basis of some recent studies it would seem that the difference between the space-oriented Apollonian mind and the time-oriented Faustian one should be analysed also in relation to the difference between being and becoming. The fact that primitive people, like the Balinese, are preoccupied with imitation of patterns indicates that they are more interested in remaining the same than in becoming different. In the "being" attitude "change

⁵ O. Spengler, *The Decline of the West* (New York, 1927), Vol. 1.

and becoming are foreign to thinking."⁶ Unlike the primitives the Greeks, at least since the time of Heraclitus, apprehended change and were, therefore, able to think and judge in terms of spatial rather than temporal differences, to distinguish novelty from repetition, and to appreciate the originality of ideas and designs. If however, despite the difference between Greek and primitive thought, it is correct to make a distinction between the Apollonian and the Faustian, it is because changes-in-being for the Greeks were limited to changes in the "now." The Greek conception of infinity remained spatial and was apprehended as a void, a space emptied of beings. The Greeks of the classical age therefore lacked that sense of solitude that can be fully apprehended only in relation to and endless becoming, for it is only when infinity has been included in an existential mode of thinking that art is changed into prayer, into a one way communication on of "the alone to the Alone," as Plotinus saw it.

Due to F. M. Cornford,⁷ deep understanding of early Greek philosophy it is now possible to trace the decisive steps which led the Greeks to develop their thinking along the lines of geometric patterns: When Parmenides declared, "The I is a whole in the now" he defined, what could be called, the spatial limits of the "I". What else is "a whole in the now" but a form which, like all objects in space can be described in geometric terms? The "I" of Parmenides shares with geometric forms the property of being limited, as contrasted to an illimited form, or being, which is conceivable only in infinity.

The being's limits do not constitute, however, unsurmountable barriers; the mere fact that beings understand each other indicates that their limitation is not absolute, for as Socrates said in Plato's *Parmenides*, "We participate of forms both alike and unlike." In other words, Plato found a "geometric" solution to the major difficulty that Parmenides' theory presented to the thinkers of his time. It is as if Plato had said that "unlike forms," such as the square and triangle, possess like qualities because they have one line as common property. What else does this mean but that "unlike forms" *participate* through certain of their attributes in a common reality (or existence)? Because participation has a form "we participate of forms." Like all forms participation is "a whole in the now" and can be analysed as such.

Participation is achieved by overcoming limits or barriers. In this light the crossing of barriers turns out to be a problem of communication and

⁶ O. Lee: "Being and Value in Primitive Culture," *Journal of Philosophy* (June, 1949), No. 13.

⁷ F. M. Cornford, *Plato and Parmenides* (1939).

should, therefore, be examined in relation to language which is the most general and basic form of interpersonal communication. Reduced to its most schematic aspect, culture is the synthesis of the various means of communication. This is what must be understood by Hegel's famous dictum that language is the actuality of culture. When seen as a form of communication, art is actually nothing else but a particular language.

To go back to Spengler we can now say that if the Greeks produced such remarkable sculptors, painters and architects it is because they proved to have excelled in those forms of art which lend themselves more readily than others to the evocation of space-consciousness. Despite the fact that painting, sculpture and architecture express relations in space they can serve to evoke infinity. Thus the difference in proportion between figures or between figures and ground arouses space anxiety which is experienced in the feeling of being too big or too small, too near or too far. This is tantamount to saying that the Faustian spirit of Gothic and romantic art is expressed on the spatial level in terms of *disproportion*.

Man sought through the visual arts to answer a basic question concerning his existence: "Where am I?" "In the right place" is the answer of the Apollonian artist. Probably no painter ever expressed with greater eloquence than did Velasquez the sense of security arising from the feeling of being in the right place. All doubt as to the presence of the being-in-the-now was crushed, as it were, under the weight Velasquez gave to his figures. And no artist expressed the fear of not being in the right place as Bosch did in his *Prodigal Son*. In this painting the disproportion between the central figure and the background figures, the direction followed by the eyes of the Prodigal Son, and that followed by his body, lead one to doubt whether the figure's "I" is actually in the now.

Alienation from space which so preoccupied mystic painters was reintroduced in our time by Chirico and the surrealists, with this difference, however, that they shifted the emphasis from the illusion of "not being in the now" to that of being in a superreality.

While disproportion conveys the fear of space, evocation of sound or movement provokes anxiety by suggesting a failure of space. In Bellini's *Saint Francis* of the Frick Museum the spectator has the illusion that he can actually hear the voice of the Saint carrying him beyond the now. With El Greco, the flaming musicality of melting figures and burning hearts bestows upon the painting an oratorio-like quality. In Giorgione's *Concert*, on the contrary, music is evoked negatively, by omission, for sound is drowned in the stillness of the now.

While the function of painting is to describe the position of the being in the now, that of music is to retrace his efforts, to move away from the now, and even away from space and into the beyond. Therefore great painting which evokes the beyond is always musical. El Greco and Cézanne succeeded in creating the impression that the now was disappearing into eternity by repeating in a color scheme that suggests eventual etherialization, a pattern of acute triangles pointed upwards. But it is doubtful whether such a pictorial organization conveys the same meaning when it is used in abstract art. When viewing a painting of Kandinsky the spectator is not uplifted because the pattern never suggests displacement for, owing to the elimination of figures, space becomes too empty to suggest space consciousness, which is a state of mind derived from the being's awareness that space is the now of his existence. Kandinsky's paintings are decorative rather than evocative, arabesque-like rather than musical, flat instead of poetic.

In an attempt to express movement abstract artists appear to be using signs that indicate movement and thus confuse two levels of communication, the indicative one of charts with the expressive one of painting. Picasso made a similar error in his *Guernica* and confused pictorial expression with cartographic indication. Cartography is the language that isolates space from movement to enable one to figure out the eventual movements of bodies over the described space. *Guernica* resembles too much a map of horror to evoke horror. One is given to survey the extent of pain instead of being led to join the people in their suffering. When the position of a locality is only indicated as in the case of maps, or when the movement of a figure is determined in relation to other figures at the expense of a space which appears to have been discarded, as is the case in *Guernica*, the effect is cold: atmosphere gives warmth to a place, volume to a body. Only when the pattern is woven in a material as rich as is that of oriental carpets can the coldness of abstract design be effectively overcome.

While Kandinsky tried to interpret pure space in Faustian terms, Mondrian devoted himself with ascetic rigor to conveying his quasi-mystical fascination with the void in Apollonian terms. But space is not emptiness, as his nihilistic painting suggests, and all attempts, whether made in life or in art to reach emptiness, are self-defeating.

Until recently visual arts in Western culture have followed a Parmenidian line of development and express the conviction that in the now there is a being. If, however, for some reason this being is lost from sight, if his image becomes taboo, then sculpture and painting will be reduced to purely decorative effects.

From these arguments we can now conclude that the Greeks were aesthetic-minded not because they made of geometry a prerequisite of learning, but because, being worshippers of the human image, they placed man in the center of space and thereby became aware of the relation between man and space. Even Aristotelian philosophy which is the high mark arrived at by Greek thought is haunted by images; it is, so to speak, the form of images and like the shadow or the outline of omitted figures; like Greek art it is anthropocentric, and the view of life according to which man is the center is pictorial as Plutarch's definition of history as "eloquent painting" suggests.

Greek logic is imagistic although it is not so exclusively as is prehellenic thought. Pre-classical abstraction is derived from similitude of appearances which lead a child or a primitive to believe that manifestations such as clouds and smoke are identical. This similarity abstraction is achieved by identifying common traits in unrelated objects.

Unlike Aristotelian logic modern logic is iconoclastic, for instead of replacing the image with its form, instead of substituting the general to the particular, it does away with images entirely, replacing them with function. It is only after science ceased to see abstraction, as the Greek geometrician did in terms of generalizations achieved by abstracting form from content, that mathematical logic came into its own. For mathematics the problem is not to arrive at knowledge by conveniently "forgetting" qualities and retaining a pure form, but it is the reverse and consists in establishing relations in a functional whole: "[It is] to the extent that the concept is freed of all thing-like being that its peculiar functional character is revealed."⁸

How western culture developed this process in its long struggle against the obsession with images has been related by Gaston Bachelard⁹ in his work *La Fonction de l'Esprit Scientifique* which significantly bears the sub-title "Contribution à la psychanalyse de l'esprit scientifique." The outlining and the serial evaluation of decisive moments in an experiment, Bachelard says, constitutes the primordial task the scientific mind must face. This geometric figuration, midway between experience and mathematics, forms the link that unites laws and facts. As example of geometric representation, the author mentions the philosophy of Descartes, the mechanics of Newton and the optics of Fresnel. But eventually science breaks down these naive spatial illustrations and discovers instead "spaces of configuration" which appear to underlie the sensible space. This is the reason why, in contemporary physics, the role of mathematics has to be extended far beyond geometric descriptions.

⁸ Ernst Cassirer, *Substance and Function*.

⁹ Gaston Bachelard, *La Fonction de l'Esprit Scientifique*.

The mathematician no longer describes for he now constructs forms. The science of reality is no longer satisfied to discover the phenomenological "how" but is in quest of the mathematical "why." In an epigrammatic sentence Bachelard exclaims: "To build mathematical thought one must be an iconoclast." This is why the savant "has more faith in the realism of measure than in the reality of objects."

When Henri Poincaré spoke of the beauty and elegance of mathematics, he paved the way for artists and scientists to communicate with each other through participation in a common admiration of form. But it does not follow that because their activity can be extended beyond geometric description that it should be now limited to the elaboration of spaces of configuration. The artist has generally understood form in relation to a being within the form; in other words, he evaluates form iconolatrically. All attempts to realize the Pythagorean ideal and reduce visual art to the harmony of musical notes as Kandinsky sought to do derive from a misunderstanding of the role of form.

The basic function of painting and sculpture is not to solve technical problems related to form but to help one overcome the fear of isolation by developing space-consciousness. Man being a-whole-in-the-now fears isolation and seeks communication. But not until one has been convinced that something outside one's self is true is it worth while giving up one's solitude.¹⁰ Painting therefore must convey a truth which by the very nature of its means of expression is related to space consciousness. What other truth in space can the being seek but the one referring to the position he or his neighbor occupy in it?

The place to be occupied can be represented either as phantastic or real, and the reality can either be photographic or idealized and perfected in the sense that Piranesi corrected Roman ruins, or, lastly, it can be distorted to express a mood like Van Gogh's.¹¹

In the last analysis iconolatric art conveys its message through images of beloved beings and loved places because the ultimate truth the artist communicates is conditioned by his need to overcome solitude, a goal that can

¹⁰ This quasi-animal solitude which could be termed prelinguistic must not be confused with the Faustian solitude of the man who has learned not to fear isolation.

¹¹ Iconoclastic art, on the other hand, whether Arabic or modern, contains no truth because it has eliminated the being; its value remains purely decorative and will be appreciated either for the calligraphic purity or the mechanical precision with which it unfolds its pattern. In this case one shall not look for talent in the artist, but for evidences of his virtuosity; what will count will not be his ability to say the truth but the facility with which he makes use of words.

only be achieved by appealing to the sympathy of others. In visual arts the spectator's interest is awakened and held by a likable figure or place; as the most intense form of sympathy is love, the message of art is a message of love. The appeal to sympathy, however, can be also expressed negatively by turning the object of the artist's attention into an unlikable one. What the artist cannot do, without either substituting action to communication or confusing action with communication, is to replace the image with an effigy or a machine.

An effigy is not a work of art because it is a target against which certain actions are directed rather than a composition that conveys a message.¹² The magician or the schizophrenic instead of expressing their hostility toward a given person by communicating their dislike to others through the medium of a composition, direct their hostility toward the person's effigy by hammering nails into it or setting fire to it, in the expectation that the action directed against it will affect the being whom it represents.

The machine, as Hans Sachs has shown,¹³ is an externalization of the inventor's body image that has been projected in the outside world so that he might rid himself of the narcissistic fear that his double will destroy him. By giving his double an outward form the inventor, whose clinical prototype is the schizophrenic, is able to rid himself of phantasies that are dangerous for his inner peace and security.

Unlike the effigy which is the end-in-view of our actions, the machine serves to act in our place. The invention of a machine corresponds to psychological needs that are very different from those conditioning the creation of a work of art: while the artist, by reproducing the features of a loved one on canvas, figuratively introduces the model into his inner world, the inventor by visualizing his body in space ejects it from his inner world. Further, while in art the distance between spectator and picture is small enough to create the illusion that one can communicate with the image through the eyes, in mechanics the distinction between the actions of the machine and those of its operator is clear enough for the machine to accomplish that which the operator alone would not dare do.

Paintings and machines are both loaded with magic implications. The illusion of communicating with the image the way lovers communicate with

¹² Ernst Kris and Else Pappenheim, "The Function of Drawings and the Meaning of the 'Creative Spell' in a Schizophrenic Artist," *The Psychoanalytical Quarterly* (January, 1946), Vol. 15.

¹³ Hans Sachs, "The Delay of the Machine Age," *The Psychoanalytical Quarterly* (1933), Vol. 2.

each other through the eyes stems from the magical belief that two similar objects, such as the portrait and the model, are identical—the way the effigy and the person it represents are said to be identical; a portrait can be worshipped like an idol (the latter is nothing but a glorified effigy) and expected to hearken to our prayer; a machine which is identified with the operator can be expected to realize unavowed wishes; it is a kind of supereffigy which translates criminal intentions in terms of accidents.

As for the blue print which serves to communicate how a machine is made, it not a work of art because it is a message that is delivered in terms of apperceptive thinking. We are indebted to the Russian psychologist Vigotsky¹⁴ for establishing a clear and precise distinction between apperceptive and emotional thinking. The former is achieved by elimination of metaphors and images and is social, while the latter is imagistic and personal. It would follow, therefore, that because the social is multipersonal that the value of apperceptive communication is interpersonal, which is tantamount to saying that apperceptive thinking is based on language because, as has already been said, language is the form by means of which individuals are able to understand each other. This need for understanding stems either from the desire to communicate a personal message or from the need to arrive at a common decision.

In the last analysis the personal message is emotional and purports to communicate what was unknown or hidden and deals with the truth because its objects is to reveal the secrets of our soul. Emotional language is always dramatic because the message it conveys to others refers to our feelings of guilt which only those who have the courage of poets dare to reveal. When, however, individuals communicate their thoughts for the purpose of elaborating a common plan of action, then the accepted plan becomes the form of the future action. To think in terms of the execution of a plan is to think apperceptively, for by reading the signs of the message explaining the action we learn the sequence of events and understand the order of things. In a poetic communication we are asked instead to incorporate in the field of our sensitivity symbols the poet used so that we might experience what he evokes. It follows that the more abstract and apperceptive is the language in which a certain message is communicated the clearer will be its meaning, while the more it is loaded with images and metaphors the more difficult will the reader find it to remain unmoved by what the poet has to say.

Greek logic never discovered functional abstraction because thinking in

¹⁴ Vigotsky, "Thought and Speech," *Psychiatry* (1939), Vol. 2.

ancient Greece was never planned by a team but was imposed upon others by individual thinkers occupying a privileged position. Greek philosophic thinking was individual and not interpersonal because intellectual cooperation was limited to the exchange of ideas and never led to planned action.

Functional abstraction could be comprehended only after machines were substituted to the work of man or domestic animals. But the idea of using machines for work could not occur till an interpersonal plan of action was substituted to a personal plan of production. Men began to think of production in interpersonal terms when the accumulation of wealth in the form of finance capital made them realize that money (the interpersonal on the economic level) was not only a means of exchange but, through the institution of banks, a source of wealth. Before the machine could be understood in terms of labor, it could only function in a non-productive sense. It is because the Romans were unable to understand function that the use of the machines they invented and that worked with hydraulic or even steam pressure was limited, as Hans Sachs correctly points out, to the field of play. Likewise, before the importance of function could be properly estimated, it was impossible to establish groups whose role was to develop functional language in laboratories through team work.

But as the example of Henri Poincaré shows, when the scientist reconsiders his work from a personal point of view rather than from a social one, he, like any other individual, can become sensitive to its pattern and admire its beauty and elegance. Further, a functioning machine can become the object of an artistic communication as Fernand Leger has made us realize, but the purpose of the machine itself is to translate in terms of action a command that was given in a scientific language.

It is by the perfection of function obtained through the development of apperceptive thinking and which is best achieved through team work that machines are improved; perfection of mechanical form is never obtained by a process of generalization and by emptying forms of their contents, as do the constructivists. The error of these artists must be attributed to the fact that they failed to understand the difference between generalization abstraction and functional abstraction.

Just as social thinking does not replace individual thinking so apperceptive language can never become a substitute for imagistic language. The dictum that the individual is a whole in the now is as true today as it was when first formulated. What the new age has added is the realization that through the function of the machine man fears lest he be reduced to a cog. However, as the purpose of the machine is to change relationships in space, either by

moving weights or by accelerating transportation, truth for man of the machine age includes the belief in a transformation of the world. Karl Marx expressed an idea which is true for man of a scientific era (which does not cancel the existential truth of Parmenides) when he declared that we have sufficiently explained the world and that it is time to change it, although he erred when he claimed that it has been sufficiently explained. Equally mistaken however are those who fail to see the need for change. How these two points of view, the scientific and the existential, are to be correlated instead of the one being sacrificed for the benefit of the other seems to be the major task of the thinkers of our time. In this respect new insight can be acquired by listening to the message of artists, for it is they who are particularly attuned to the understanding of the relationship between the being, the now and patterns.

As the artist lives in a group his emotional language is influenced by social language and he often borrows expressions or patterns of thought belonging to the language of functional abstraction. This is what the cubists and especially Marcel Duchamp have been so successful in doing. But with them the end-in-view remains imagistic while function serves to communicate the image.

The three types of abstraction discussed here, that is to say similarity, generalization and functional abstraction, should not be confused with the so-called abstract drawings of children, schizophrenics or primitives. Actually these are not authentic abstractions but selections of what appears to a certain type of mind as the essential traits of a model. When a child draws a human head as a plain circle, he is using what he considers to be an adequate form of presentation;¹⁵ the sign of the circle has imagistic content and can signify head. The difference between a child's portrait of his father whose head is represented by a circle and that by a renaissance painter is purely linguistic: the child and the painter are not using the same pictorial vocabulary.

There is no reason why a modern artist should not use pictorial expressions borrowed from the language of children, primitives or schizophrenics. Picasso and Miro have shown how effectively this can be done. But the critic would commit a serious methodological error if he classified these artists among abstract painters. Conversely, it is not because certain abstract painters introduce the pictorial designs of primitives, children or schizophrenics in a non-figurative pattern that they cease to be abstract. It would seem that in cultures in which the predominant religion is iconoclastic, as is the case in

¹⁵ Rudolph Arnheim, "Perceptual Abstraction and Art," *Psychological Review* (1947), Vol. 54.

Protestant Holland and the U.S., artists who are attracted to abstract art—probably out of an unconscious fear of images—are often inclined to reinforce their position by borrowing "abstract-looking" forms. These artists often fail to realize that they are actually using certain signs as images of abstractions rather than as forms which have been emptied of their contents. Thus these artists are not abstract in the functional sense but in the similitude sense, and therefore remain more poetic than they are aware of. This school of romantic abstraction, when examined from the iconoclastic angle, is not abstract enough, and is anti-pictorial when seen from the imagistic one.

In so far as primitive painting, carving or basket work, is the expression of a prescientific social language it is abstract, that it is to say the forms it uses are signs rather than images, as is the case of the Christian cross atop of a monument. The type of abstraction developed by social groups on the religious or magic level differs from the functional abstraction elaborated in scientific groups; it follows the lines of similarity abstraction.

This does not mean that the abstract design which adorns the canoe and the weapons of the primitive is purely ornamental, for a role is assigned to it. When viewed, however, from the scientific angle the design's function appears to be irrational as it is established on the basis of animistic thinking for the production of magic effects. But when viewed aesthetically these patterns of the primitive can be reinterpreted. The fact that all languages, the personal, the social, the religious, the scientific, often use common forms makes it possible for human beings as unlike as an inhabitant of the Sepik river, a modern painter, a five-year-old child, and a schizophrenic to reproduce identical designs. Form can be loaded with many meanings but when it comes to evaluate a work of art it is necessary to replace it in its historical sequence and to discover its true meaning, for the function of art is not to imitate art, as has been recently suggested¹⁶ but to express intentions of beings who, because they are wholes in the now, are not conditioned by art alone. The purpose of art is not to imitate but to reveal man's most intimate secrets. A sense of guilt and anxiety compels the artist to pursue this task with infinite precautions and to express himself in formulae rendered as attractive as the magic of his art can make them.

The magic of art lies in the artist's ability to discover similarities between objects whose appearance did not previously seem to show any affinity. The formula or pattern according to which the magic is conveyed vary according to time and place, but the need to interest one's neighbors in one's secret remains unchanged since the time of the Sphinx.

¹⁶ Andre Malraux, *Museum Without Walls* (Bollingen, New York, 1949).

OROZCO, GENIUS OF AMERICA¹

By Justino Fernández

OROZCO is dead and Mexico mourns; all through the Americas there will be grief and sorrow because his prodigious hand can never again paint the truth as he alone knew how to paint it. Now the drama of man will no longer find expression in the moving forms of his art. The scaffolding before his final mural has been taken down and they have placed a wreath on his tomb.

However, in the presence of the death of genius, there can be no wailing; we must keep watch in the hushed silence of our inner self, out of respect for our great friend, the man who really leaves an empty space. The greatness of his work will not let the spirit retreat, but drives it forward without rest. Such was his life, his art and his example.

Rare indeed is genius for rare are the men who achieve its essential yet unstable balance. For some, genius is random force, a divine madness; for others, genius is calmness and serenity, absolute balance; for me, it is controlled passion, a lyric sense of man's limits—to be fixed, yet in motion—a paradox, a spinning balance attained and lost and reattained. There is no better example of this than that cupola at Guadalajara, within whose compass—essential and limited like all things human—all the possibilities of being are before you, and in its center the greatest possibility of man's greatness, to live, consumed by fire, a symbol for consciousness.

Thus lived Orozco, consumed by fire yet converted into life for others; for will he not live on in the walls and ceilings that he painted and as long as any world finds room for human values? Just as some are converted into books or memories, good or bad, Orozco to the very limits of his being was converted into painting, that best kind of painting which is not done with oils but with the whole life's blood.

Orozco is the first great creative genius in American art, the first one to appear since America became America; with full awareness, like Cortés he burned his ships behind him to find out whether he could get along on his own. He wrote:

"Why do we have to be eternally on our knees before the Kants and

¹ This article first appeared in *Cuadernos Americanos*, No. 6, 1949, and was translated by John W. Culver, professor of Latin-American History, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Hugos of the world? Glory be to the masters! But we, too, can produce a Kant or a Hugo. We too can wrench the iron out from the bowels of the earth and make machines and ships. We know how to build great cities, create nations and explore the universe. Did we not come of a race of titans?"

Glory be to the masters—he says—they are other men, the past that he respects; there is no question of unconscious denial, but a program of a new and grandiose adventure; to be oneself, by one's own efforts, feeling oneself the heir of glorious traditions and intending to give them new life here in America.

Another time, at Dartmouth College, he expressed himself in this way: "It is useless to speak of the Tradition. Of course, we must line up and learn our lesson from the masters. If there is another way, it has not yet been discovered. It appears that the line of descent of culture is continuous and unbroken from an unknown beginning to an unknown end. But now we take pride in saying, this is not imitation; it is our own effort within the limits of our own capacity and experience—sincere and spontaneous."

His life was a constant effort to be himself within his American environment, and therefore, within himself he confronted the spiritual problems of our time with such understanding and in terms of such importance that it is clear that he is of the breed of titans and takes his place among them.

He thought about—expressed in his paintings, for in Orozco are united the thinker and the artist—this America as a new and human world from its beginnings, not as a new *thing*. He thought about and expressed the idea of the Conquest in terms of all mankind, not in terms of likes and dislikes, of equally discredited ideas of Spain or of the Indian; he saw from the meeting of diverse cultures as from a painful birth, there emerged a new world. He never played politics with this theme, for he was trying to see clearly the truth about ourselves, not to raise monuments to one group or another, so that his work becomes a monument to America.

With a sharp sense of reality he painted the Mexico of today, in the light of its history, and so interpreted the history of the whole world, and this is why his work is universal, because he never thought of America, of Mexico, or even of himself as an isolated fact, except in relation to all and to all others.

At the beginning of his mural work, he painted *Christ Destroying His Own Cross*, as if he despaired of all salvation, as if he rejected the very possibility, and at the same time, he brought once more into art a transcendent sense, he decided to burn himself out—exactly that. This is the road he travelled from the murals of the Preparatoria to the cupola of Guadalajara;

when he came to that of the ex-church of Jesus, the man on fire could not dare to show His face for it would be too fearful to behold.

To his authentic liberal sense of human existence corresponds his politics as well; ever truthful, he hated lies and farce, never offered aspirins, and so he could lay about him lustily both left and right. For this reason some have taken him for a destructive anarchist or for a contradictory and negative spirit. One could say that his ideal was Freedom for the Truth, for there can be nothing higher though more difficult, more expressive of his absolute good faith. Liberty and creative action in art were something more than symbols for him; he was never brutalized by politics and only a few understood what he was trying to say when he stated:

"Artists do not have nor have ever had political convictions of any sort and those who believe that they have them, are not artists." Orozco is an exemplary case of liberty, of the kind that one creates for himself, which he takes, and which he made, and for this (therefore) on seeing his works, the spirit moves freely and goes on through the anguish and horror of this world, consumed by fire, forgetting the body.

He is even more, a paradox and a genius; for no one more than Orozco has expressed the real and the concrete, yet no one more than he knew better how to give it his exact value and remain suspended in its own flame. His work has a relation to the immediate, a very direct one; yet he changes it all into something universal and this is his creative capacity and his final sense of existence which holds our interest at this point. Thus, his contemporary and specific themes have a substance of their own, like chapters of a work that must be read between the lines, forgetting the entire printed page. Exactly because his work is mixed and shot through with history, we have a final proof of its humanism, of its greatness as art—viewed from every perspective.

His unique and explicit theme is man here and now, a concrete individual, for he knew that to be a man is to be an individual, to take his own and personal responsibility and live, being consumed by fire. There is no need to say that he was not concerned with the isolated individual except in necessary relations with others and with all that constitutes his historic (real) world. Those who detest this individualism hope for others to save them or consume them, either to burn or to save humanity. Orozco condemned himself to movement.

The "further on" of this world appears in his work as a limit for men, an unknown as it were, like a black opening leading to every kind of possibility, but black; he knew of existence here, between the unknown Beginning and unknown End; he knew only the fire.

As we have said, Orozco is a modern man such as has not been found in art, and is an American.² The first because of his decision to be consumed by fire; the second because of his interest and his work. We must consider the meaning that he will come to have in the history of culture of the twentieth century.

Compared to the great artists of the modern age, Orozco's position and place are secure. Raphael is an idealist, tied to tradition with his gaze turned back on antiquity; he is a new beatitude; in him there is no drama. Michelangelo is another sort of idealist, tormented, unsatisfied, who found in neoplatonism, according to Panofsky, the metaphysical justification of his own being: there coincides in him the nonacceptance of the reality of existence and the cure for it at the same time; in this is found his drama. Goya is an immanentist in the modern sense whose resolutions seem only to refer to what is going on in this world. Orozco is the one who sees modern times with full conscience, fully, for neither is he a saint with his eyes on the past, nor unsatisfied, nor does he swear by a possible or impossible "further beyond"; but decides to be consumed by fire here, in the reality of what this is as well as in the very fire of his own creative activity. Of course, if the phrase should require further development, Orozco seems closer to Goya than to any one else, but the difference lies in that Orozco took all things to their extreme, on a heroic scale, which Goya never accomplished whatever else one may think about him.

After Ingres and Delacroix, painting was taken on the ingenious path of "art for art's sake" or "pure art," a typically absurd invention of the bourgeois world, a formalism within which painting remained buried up to our time. Moreover, it changed into a pastime, concerned with tiny abstractions or with infantile decorative spontaneities, save only Mexican mural painting and certain other exceptions in Europe: Roualt, Dali in some cases, and the great Picasso. This last-named great artist, a genius without doubt, admirable, whose position consists with respect to modernism, in saying something old in new forms, for Picasso seems to me to be an *essentialist*, especially since, apart from the notion of the *joie de vivre*, so dear to "art for art's sake," his constant emphasis on the symbol of the seated woman, among others, refers the spectator to a permanent essence, immutable, eternal, which is reflected in the mirrors of the past and of the future in a repetition changing only in form, being, supposedly, always the same. In truth, Picasso concedes little importance to historic forms, or to time, which is just an accident; what in-

² American in the sense that he is a man of this continent.

terests him is that permanent and unique essence; for this reason he plays with form, but not with content. Picasso is a modern classicist whose classicism consists in being an essentialist and whose modernism is expressed in taking life as best he can, though of course there are at times some obstacles such as *Guernica*, but there are few in his work.

In relation to the others among the creators of Mexican mural painting. Rivera and Siqueiros, Orozco seems quite distinct as might be expected, for Rivera is a classicist in form, and a modern, uninterested in everything save the triumph of man in this world—via historical materialism—and throughout the upheavals of history, as a good classicist he aspires to repose at last; for him, the drama is history to be remodeled, for the important thing is to arrive at the goal—unruffled and serene. Siqueiros appears to be a modern classicist (in one way) in terms of some of his forms, but otherwise not; he seems uninterested in all save action; if the oppressed did not exist, he would invent them, such is his necessity to be moved; it is movement which interests him; rather than to be consumed like Orozco, Siqueiros exhausts himself in action.

It is certain that in portraying them in a few bold strokes, as I do, I lose sight of other aspects of the painters I am considering here, Orozco included, but I wanted to reduce the panorama to the essential. Now, considering the modes of life in the past and in the present of modernism, Orozco is the one, I was saying, who fully realizes modern man, not disinterested in his transcendancy, but having resolved it with a courage quite unequalled anywhere, he does not decide in favor of the *joie de vivre*, but for the anguish in living, as clearly as he saw the anguish of man, feeling that pain himself and filling himself with it.

An interesting spectacle is to see how, in spite of our present sorrows and the imminent peril of even more, the conscience revealed by contemporary painting, in general, is the type "*joie de vivre*," ("Art for Art's sake" is understood) that is, not to confront our historical-spiritual problems but to abandon oneself to *juissance* (joyful pretense?) of forgetting them, a sin that even Baudelaire would have condemned. Faced with this situation, mural painting in Mexico has a place apart, exceptional, because in one way—that of Rivera or Siqueiros, in the historical-social—or in another way that of Orozco, in the historic-philosophic, Mexican mural painting has made the problems of man in our time its special object of attention. That America expresses its conscience in this way, and that in becoming conscious of itself, it feels itself to be in solid relation with the rest of the world and that it may be expressed in great art forms, seems to be in line not only with the times but with an ultimate sense of human dignity, laudable from any point of view. While the

world argues with itself and is being clawed to pieces today for the sake of a better tomorrow, European painting, in general, continues to cling to a unique absolute in which it seems lost, the *joie de vivre*, and this no doubt has a profound meaning, perhaps an ultimate sense of conservatism, with or without dignity.

Orozco is the highest exponent in contemporary art of the American conscience, the most modern and most "up-to-date"—and clearly, not only in terms of his spiritual attitude, but also for the moving, grandiose and original forms in which he expressed himself. I call him the *genius of America*, because his expression has an authentic *bravura* which would be inconceivable in another place, without a tinge of his universality.

Picasso is the highest exponent of European conscience in contemporary art; for as a classicist, he is somehow a traditionalist, yet original in his forms; however, he does not reach, but only at moments nears, the monumental stature of Orozco.

If Orozco is a fully modern man, as I think, with a basis of fire and Picasso a half-way modern with a basis of *joie de vivre*, did the Mexican resolve and have the audacity to take a step forward that the Spaniard, more cautious, did not nerve himself to take? A question of taste, some will say, of circumstance others will say, of circumstances of life raised to artistic categories you may be certain; in any case, two distinct manners of feeling, thinking, imagining and painting what life really means.

With respect to the question of European and American conscience, it is not my intention to point out a radical dualism, in any case untenable, nor to deny the values of European painting; it is a question of the (general) spiritual circumstances of the culture of the West in which two great artists used different forms; Orozco drawing ever closer to danger, risking all; Picasso remaining ever at a little distance, but both with supreme mastery.

However, many will have to learn, for their own good, that Mexico, that America, has produced the great painting of our time and that its sharp historic conscience has been extended to the limit by the new and fecund genius of Orozco, whose dramatic expression has implications, as yet unsuspected, in the culture of that century to which from other sources has come the atomic bomb. Orozco hated all things mechanical; life, converted into art, with an acute critical sense, was for him the meaning of being an artist. He felt and expressed as no one else the pain of being mortal, the pleasures of creating, and accepted those conditions without reserve. To experience the joy of being an artist, he sublimated that pain to the category of a strong and beautiful art. He had faith in life, and by converting it into fire made of himself a flaming guide. This is the meaning, for me, of his whimsical life.

OROZCO'S STYLISTIC EVOLUTION

By Jean Charlot

AS IS customary in treating of the work of important artists, critics have attempted to interpret Orozco's stylistic evolution. Such attempts remain premature until the different parts of his work fit into a more definitive chronological sequence than is the case at present. For example important sources of style have been overlooked or underestimated: for a decade Orozco was preeminently a cartoonist, following the great Mexican tradition of Constantino Escalante and Villasaña, and his monumental work of today still shows the conditioning of hand and brain working at the grinding job of issuing daily topical satirical drawings. Some of the critics who analyzed the sources of Orozco's style, more easily aware of scholarly influences such as those of Byzantium and the Italian Renaissance, ignored these less learned, if most vivid, models. Other commentators, though well aware of this, preferred to bypass the early period in order not to displease the quick tempered artist, mistakenly disdainful of the less dignified productions of his youth.

The major obstacle to an understanding of Orozco's *oeuvre* remains the insecure dating of much of his work, a state of affairs unusual in the case of a contemporary artist. The main object of this analysis is to propose a correct respective dating of the early drawings and wash drawings that divide naturally into two series, that of women: schoolgirls and prostitutes, and that of episodes of the Revolution. Present dating, such as that used in the National Show of 1947, held in the Palacio de Bellas Artes, Mexico City, presents the two series as overlapping in time regardless of the wide divergence of styles. To correct this generally accepted dating we quote from what passages bear on the sequence of the artist's work in the writings of contemporary critics.

Earliest public mention refers to his contribution to the all-Mexican show that took place in 1910 at the Academy of San Carlos.¹ It divides his contribution into two groups, caricatures and compositions. Of the latter group, presumably serious in intent, given that it is contrasted with the caricatures by the reviewer, nothing remains today. The artist remembered only that they were charcoal drawings.

What did the caricatures look like? They showed "strong draftsmanship, with lines bold and firm, supremely expressive and full of very deep inten-

¹ Genaro Garcia, *Cronica oficial de las fiestas del primer centenario* (Mexico, 1911).

tions." This description fits as well a slightly later set of cartoons—and the earliest still preserved—that Orozco did in 1911-1912 for *El Abuirote*. We may surmise in turn that the caricatures shown in 1910 were of similar vintage, minus the added zest that the fall of Porfirio Diaz and the rise of Madero gave to Orozco's political outlook soon after the close of the San Carlos show.

The next description of Orozco's work is found in the Tablada interview of November 1913, written after the assassination of President Madero, while General Victoriano Huerta was dictator and president.² The live stuff of which the Revolution drawings of Orozco are powerful reflections permeated the scene. Mexico City had experienced a few months before *La Decena Tragica*, the tragic ten days, a city-wide civil war that had strewn so many corpses in the gutters that funeral pyres were hastily improvised to minimize the danger of a plague. A young painter Alfredo Zalce remembers of these days how as a child going to grammar school he had failed to return one afternoon from his classes. His alarmed parents, scouting the neighborhood in despair, finally located the lad squatting entranced beside a sprawling corpse, watching flies caper along its frozen features. Doubtless, Orozco too drank in the strong spectacle with a deeper insight and optical persistency than many a citizen. But it appears that none of his reactions took the form of sketches. The artist's reputation at that date, his aesthetic preoccupations and actual realizations are all clearly set down in Tablada's article, whose title emphasizes the difference between the young Orozco and the mature master of today: "A painter of woman."

When the artist gives his name to his host, Tablada, "I place him mentally. Orozco; the cartoonist? Now I remember certain cartoons in *El Abuirote*, rich in intention, in energy and cruelty. . . . As I ask what his favorite subject-matter may be, he answers that nowadays he paints exclusively women, limiting himself to college girls and prostitutes. "Of the writer's visit to the artist's studio: "On the walls and in portfolios the water colors, pastels and drawings that are up to now the whole work of Orozco. As the artist said, woman is the perpetual theme of all these works. . . ."

By 1914 Huerta was in flight; Carranza, Villa and Zapata were engaged in a royal melee around the vacant presidential chair. Channelled into politics by his friend and exalted mentor, Dr. Atl, Orozco sided with Carranza, following him into hasty retreat when enemy hordes overran the capital. In and

² José Juan Tablada, "Un pintor de la Mujer: José Celestino Orozco," *El Mundo Ilustrado* (November 9, 1913).

around the staff headquarters in Orizaba, Orozco witnessed another chunk of active revolutionary turmoil, including the looting of churches and the daily shooting of white-clad Zapatistas. We have a series of drawings dating from this very place and period, those that the artist made for "La Vanguardia," a periodical printed through 1915 to uphold the morale of the Carranzistas at this the leanest moment of their political and military fortunes.

Comparing the "Vanguardia" illustrations with those that the artist contributed a few years before to *El Abuzote*, one realizes how his style has matured in the ratio of the simplification of his means. No more washes of intermediate grays, no more intricate cross-hatchings. The 1915 drawings are evoked in a kind of plastic shorthand, a thick crinkled line jotted down with an ink-loaded brush or reed. An oriental economy of statement tends to cram the fewest possible lines with saturated emotion. As to subject matter, there are searing political attacks on Huerta and on the Villa puppet, President Roque Gonzalez Garza, comical renderings of ladies, presumably of reactionary leanings, also anticlerical cartoons. The more direct references to the raging civil war are carefully contrived to present the Revolution at its alluring best, an understandable editorial slant in a paper whose purpose was to buck up the spirit of momentarily defeated troops: These propaganda drawings are variants of the previous school girl's series, with a caption designed to give a novel slant to the pre-revolutionary types. Under a set of girlish heads, with hair-ribbons and wide eyes appeared "Soldiers of the Revolution, your mates are awaiting your return to give you your well-deserved reward!" Or a girl of the same pattern, with the ribbon replaced by a military cap, and a cartridge belt and bandoleer slung over the school girl skirt and blouse, smiles widely, arms raised against an apotheosis of sunrays. Nowhere is there even a premonition of the bitterness and hopelessness that are synonymous with the Revolution drawings that we know today.

In 1915, Carranza returns victorious to the capital, and Orozco's political tutor, Atl, is instrumental in the sack of one of the city's churches, with Orozco presumably again an attentive witness, again storing up memories. All through the revolution the artist seems to have followed the method that Tablada relayed in 1913, "He tells me that he had drawn much from the model at the school of Fine Arts, and that now, to shake off academism, he prefers to observe the model in movement, storing mental impressions that he paints later." How much later than the events depicted were drawn and painted the episodes of the Revolution?

In May, 1916, Orozco contributes to a group show—some watercolors of prostitutes similar to those that Tablada had seen in 1913.³ On this occa-

sion, the artist's friend Atl gives us a total listing of Orozco's works that brings up to date the one given three years before by Tablada: "The series of works shown here is but one of the facets of his temperament. To judge him *in toto*, it is imperative to look at his drawings of school girls, his political and anti-clerical cartoons, and his strong symbolical drawings. The day that Orozco shows those works as a unit, the public will be better able to appreciate him at his worth. . . ."

The following September Orozco gives his first one-man show. Its catalogue lists as the *pièce de résistance* the twin sets on feminine subjects, school girls and prostitutes. Besides, it lists political caricatures, and two studies for the major 1915 oil, "San Juan de Ulua," a first government commission. That the artist was not keeping any important thing in his portfolios, such as a set of revolution drawings that would have been a striking departure from the style and subject of his known work, is made clear when, in 1923, he reminisces, "In 1916, I gave an exhibition that summed up my technical progresses and my esthetic ideas up to then."³

The emotional letdown resulting from the rebuffs and unkind comments evoked by his first one-man show ushers Orozco into a period of relative inactivity that was to last until mid-1923. Writing in 1922, Tablada reluctantly considered the career of the artist whom he had helped discover at an end, "Orozco gave up his life work when he sadly realized that he meant nothing to a public hopelessly incapable of appreciating his gifts."⁴

When Walter Pach visited the artist's studio in 1922, he was shown the same water colors of women that were exhibited in 1916, and it is on the strength of this evidence that he wrote the clear-sighted and enthusiastic appraisal that renewed Orozco's waning faith in his star.⁵

In December, 1922, to the show "Art Action" organized by friend Atl, Orozco contributed a number of the same water colors, and again, in March, 1923, sent some of them to the New York Independents, with the Mexican group.

From June, 1923, when he begins painting frescoes in the Preparatoria, to August, 1924, when work is officially stopped and the painter brusquely dismissed, Orozco's attention remained centered on his mural work, and a crop

³ In the magazine *Accion Mundial* of which Atl was the editor, June 3, 1916.

⁴ Quoted from a manuscript of Orozco, unpublished.

⁵ José Juan Tablada, "Mexican Painting Today," *International Studio* (January, 1923).

⁶ Walter Pach, "Impresiones sobre el arte actual de Mexico," *Mexico Moderno* (October, 1922).

of related studies preceded the execution of the giant nudes (Tzontemoc, Maternity), of the religious themes (Christ Burning His Cross, the Franciscan series), of the blown-up cartoons (The Rich Sup, the procession of *fantocci* of the second floor). The now famous Revolution murals in the same building belong to a later period. That Orozco was not pursuing at the same time that he painted these murals any innovations in subject and style on a smaller scale is made clear in Tablada's article published in the International Studio, March, 1924, "Orozco, the Mexican Goya." Tablada describes the well-known themes, school girls and prostitutes, using in part the text of his 1913 article, reproduces a number of works of the same period, and prophesies a brilliant mural career for the artist.

Orozco's first authenticated depiction of scenes witnessed in the civil war is to be found in the Orizaba fresco, painted in the lull between the stoppage of work at the Preparatoria and the resumption of the same work in 1926. Revisiting the scene of his "Vanguardia" days may have prompted the painter to recreate with the brush the models he had stored for so long at the back of his retina. This first step remains cautious. First to be painted, the top frieze, an overdoor panel, arranges men with guns and spades in a stiffly symmetrical diagonal pattern that remains more symbolical than factual. But the two uprights that flank the doorjambs are closer to things remembered, and already imbued with the bitter pessimistic mood that will stamp other Revolution scenes. A *soldadera* dries the sweat off an exhausted soldier's features, weeping rebozoed women huddle together for comfort.

When Orozco returned to the Preparatoria at the beginning of 1926, he amplified this first Revolution statement. He tore down the more damaged panels of the ground floor, both because of their ruinous condition and because the neo-classical flavor of the muscular giants did not satisfy him anymore. He was now content to have his master mason volunteer as model, whose round shoulders, and paunch, and bushy mustache, are multiplied in the frescoes of that period. He worked against extreme odds, in the often aggressive turmoil of students pranks, plodding painfully towards an individual technique, hampered by a salary far below a family's living standard, with the menace of a second suspension of the work hanging threateningly over his head. It is then that he painted on the ground floor symbolical tableaux on revolutionary themes (Revolutionary Trinity, The Trench, The Destruction of the Old Order), and in the upper corridor the series of revolutionary themes (Rearguard, Reconstruction, Grave-digger, Women in the Fields, The Adieu, etc.) that remain unmatched in his work for concentrated depth of statement.

My personal recollection places some time in the period that followed the stoppage of work at the Preparatoria the beginning of the revolutionary wash-drawings. Anita Brenner in "Idols Behind Altars," published in 1929, but whose writing is contemporary with these events, confirmed my recollection as she states, "The fresco in Orizaba, the third pier of the Preparatoria School and the changed panel in the first, several oil paintings and about fifty ink and pencil scenes of the Revolution are all of a piece in period, mood, control and expressed passion."

I asked Anita Brenner to elaborate on her published statement, and she answered:

"Dear Jean:

"I have delayed writing you the data you asked for about the personal history behind Orozco's famous Revolutionary Series, because I have been expecting my books and papers to arrive from New York, and I am quite sure that the details are in the notebook I kept at that time.

"However, since I know you need this material, I am sending you this memo, and will supplement it with excerpts from the notebook when I have it again in my possession. . . .

"You will remember that at this time, in view of the financial and emotional hardships Orozco was facing, his friends scouted around for solutions. His most insistent friend in that respect was Manuel Rodriguez Lozano, who used to come to see me often, sometimes with and sometimes without Orozco, insisting that I help. Of course I was willing to, but there wasn't very much I could do. However, I suggested we invent a mythical *gringo* who was writing a book about the Revolution, and who wanted illustrations. We told Orozco that this *gringo* would like to buy six black and whites about the Revolution, but that he was away at the moment and had left me the money to pay with, at the same time stating he was willing to take whatever I suggested. This mythical *gringo* was me, of course, and I think I borrowed the money, because I am sure I didn't have it. It was necessary to invent him, naturally, because we were afraid Orozco would not have taken the money from me, even in exchange for work.

"You will remember the excitement of Lozano and other friends when these drawings—which turned out to be no drawings at all but pen-and-ink gouaches—were completed. Orozco had the whole pent-up volcano of his experiences and his feelings in the Revolution in these. What happened also was that he himself got so interested in what he was doing that he continued with the idea after the six originals were done, as I remember the series came to something like 30 or 40. These first six I still have. . . ."

When the expected notebooks arrived from New York, in May, 1947, we checked our common recollections against the strictly contemporary entries in Anita's diary. I quote what passages I deem pertinent, either because they bear directly on the birth of the Revolution series, or because they help visualize the circumstances surrounding it: The entries start at the end of Orozco's long wait before he could resume his mural work at the school.

"December 14, 1925. Orozco to lunch. . . . Hopes to finish his Preparatoria frescoes and may do some oil work and lithographs."

"January 26, 1926. Clémente Orozco has the Preparatoria back. He is mad with joy."

"February 9. Saw Orozco. Went over Preparatoria with him about photos. He begins to paint tomorrow."

"May 2. Went out this morning to Orozco's studio with Edward Weston. Edward made some portraits of him. Orozco showed us some of his old things and a few studies for the frescoes he is doing. . . . The frescoes he is doing now is revolution stuff. On a background of ultra blue, swift volumes of gray—swirling hurried skirts of women, tramp of guaraches, guns, and rose-colored city walls— . . ."

"May 26. José Clemente Orozco in very good mood. He is working very hard he says. Wants to do 'fresco' on cement: entirely new procedure and it means new aesthetic, technique, values, everything. He says it will be '*horrible de tan fuerte*'."

"July 24. Saturday. Came José Clemente *con mucha buena voluntad* and talking through his teeth of how sick he is of being bothered at the Preparatoria. The boys make quite a fuss pro and con."

"Tuesday August 17. José Clemente brought some old newspaper clippings in which he is called many vile names. 'Shortsighted, sentimental, psychologically blunted, romantic, unformed, cartoonist, critic reformer, impotent, lascivious, frustrated, can't draw, etc. etc.' Session of raucous laughter."

"Monday, September 6. Saw Orozco. He says he is all mixed up and does not know what's what in painting. He has been quite ill. He suffers a great deal but he is doing beautiful work. I am going to get him to do a group of revolutionary drawings. Pretext of customer—He wouldn't sell to me."

"Sunday September 12. This morning went to see José Clemente. He has been told that there is no more money in the University to keep on painting with, and therefore the work at the Prep, which is going so splendidly, must stop. . . . He painted a picture to put in the book [the future *Idols Behind Altars*] a scene of the revolution. It is a palette of four colors, black, white, burnt sienna, and natural yellow. They are *tierras*—that is corresponds to what

he has been doing in fresco. With the black and white he gets a fine dull blue. The whole thing is rich and full of emotion."

"September 15. Went to Universal to take an article about Orozco, hoping thus to raise some dust about this ridiculous business of stopping his work. Have already gone to see Jimmy (Puig's secretary) about it and wrote also a spectacular letter to Pruneda."

I now quote from the carbon copy of the letter:

"Sr. Doctor Alfonso Pruneda, Rector de la Universidad Nacional de Mexico. . . . I further wish to bring to your attention the unexplained stoppage of the work of José Clemente Orozco who wields, as you know, one of the greatest among the brushes of which Mexico may pride itself. Furthermore, the work that he is now executing is of deep value, as it means, for me and for all who see it, the true aesthetic of the Revolution. I have seen his projects for the lower floor, that is now nearly the only missing stretch, and those plans, seen under such circumstances, have moved me to carry before you this protest, with which you will doubtless identify yourself, given your good judgment in such matters. I repeat that it would be an attempt against Mexico's honor to allow that, for obscure reasons that can surely be mended, this work be stopped at its emotional and technical climax. . . ."

Further diary entries:

"September 18, 1926. Only incident of importance was an interview with Dr. Pruneda about Orozco. He said that it was all right and that he had no intention of letting the work be stopped. That as further proof of his interest, I could tell Orozco that next year he would be put 'where nobody could touch him'—in the official budget as a decorator of the Prep. . . ."

"Sunday, September 19. Had lunch at Orozco's. . . . In the two first of the series of scenes of the revolution bought by a fictitious American—he came to a fusion of the grandiosity of his frescoes and the intimate curtness of his drawings. I am trying to persuade him to do enough for an exhibition. He rather fears the effect. I told him Goya was an antecedent and he says: 'But Goya is superficial. He draws carefully. He hasn't my monstrosity—nor the reality.' He speaks of striving for less motion and emotion now as a thing of 'good health.' . . . He has begun using abstract planes, semi-architecturally incorporated, to splendid effect in both fresco and small stuff."

The comparison with Goya's *Desastres de la Guerra* imposed itself, and the budding series was informally baptized *Los Horrores de la Revolucion*.

"Monday, September 20. Went and phoned Jimmy and was delighted to be told that Orozco is safely arranged."

"Wednesday, September 22. . . . Came also Orozco with another 'horror.' "

"Monday, September 26. In the evening came Orozco with two more 'horrors.' Scenes of the looting army. . . ."

"March 7, 1927. Orozco came in the evening and brought seven of those marvelous ink and wash drawings—revolution stuff. I have never seen anything like it."

"Sunday, March 20. Orozco had four more 'horrors.' That makes twenty-one. . . . Had breakfast at Sanborns with Ella, Lucy and Ernestine Evans. . . . So it is arranged that the opening of the Whitney Club will be with Orozco's things."

"March 22. This evening, Orozco came with four more 'horrors' that makes twenty-five."

"May 26. Orozco came with seven more drawings as usual breathtaking. A new quality of tranquility apparent."

"August 20. Orozco's to lunch. . . . He had two new 'horrors' and also a funny thing called 'Las Delicias del Amor.' . . ."

"Monday, August 21. Orozco told me Atl went to see him and told him that he just had to see those drawings that everyone was talking about and that Orozco told him he would ask me. . . . Until I get those things safely over the border I shan't rest easy."

Remembering that many of the early water colors of Orozco had been destroyed as 'immoral' by the American customs on his 1919 trip to the United States, one understands the note of anxiety on which these excerpts close.

Anita left for New York August 4, taking with her the bulk of the Revolution set. As she remembers it, "I took the drawings with me to New York, with the idea of getting an exhibition for him. At that time, the Mexican painters were so little known that I got a rather odd reception, and it was pointed out to me that these things weren't really art, they were drawings and cartoons suitable for the New Masses, and I was seriously advised by an art dealer who is now one of the Orozco 'discoverers' to take them to that magazine."

Soon after, Orozco left in turn for New York, with only an overnight bag for luggage and only myself to bid him adieu, and it became my responsibility to choose and take with me what finished works remained in his studio when I left Mexico for New York in October, 1928. A few remaining 'horrors' and large charcoal studies for the frescoes I artfully mingled with my own milder brand of art and all passed the customs unquestioned.

The Revolution drawings were first publicly shown in October, 1928, in New York, at the Marie Sterner Gallery, and first reproduced in their entirety in 1932, in the Delphic Studio monograph edited by Alma Read. There it is stated explicitly that the drawings are not contemporaneous with the events, "Drawings and lithographs from sketches made between 1913 and 1917." Those who know Orozco's lightning way of working believe the purported earlier sketches, never mentioned before or since, never shown, published or seen, to have been rather mental notations.

If the preceding circumstantial recital of facts carries weight, the Revolution series of wash drawings and the few related easel pictures should be advanced from the time of their subject-matter—1913-1917—to the period beginning September, 1926, when the first drawings of the set were commissioned and executed, and ending in the year 1928, when Orozco, working in his little room on West 22nd Street, New York, added a few new subjects and made replicas of some of the early drawings.

Main interest of this rectification will be to free the master's work from the implausible duality of styles implied in the assumption of an overlap in time between the delicate lines and tints of the series on feminine themes and the black-and-white of the Revolution series, both brutal and architectural, that reflects Orozco's growing mural experience in its increased grandeur and assurance.



Sinhaiese Devil Mask, 17th Century.

Courtesy Cleveland Institute of Art.

HISTORICAL ART AND CONTEMPORARY ART

By *Jesse Garrison*

THE phenomenon of time, of past, present and future, has been for a good many centuries an uneasy rack for the minds of philosophers and artists. Human life is constantly in a state of dislocation requiring heroic efforts of reorientation. As the wheel of events moves slowly or swiftly, the process of relocation is negligible or insistent. Custom and tradition rigidly determine conduct at one time; for another time the determining factor in innovation. No one can deny the circumstances which make our age one of unprecedented acceleration. A symptom of acceleration is the appearance of Cubism which terminated long established modes of thought in art and suggests other relocation in life in general. The drastic revision of a five-hundred-year-old tradition is seen by the moralist and philosopher as either regeneration or degeneration of our civilization. Loading modern art with grave portence of doom or salvation is undoubtedly a tempting activity but not necessarily an illuminating one. The heavens did not fall with past style changes; and we may see in the present one no more than a common biological tendency to live. The recent revolution of style raises many issues, one of which is the question of the value a work of art has as it recedes into the historic past. The impact upon us of a painting by Botticelli is very different from that of a work by Juan Gris. Perhaps we could say the older painting is passive while the modern one is active. For the Botticelli we have an established well-defined vocabulary. We know something of his ancestors and his descendants and can speak knowingly of the type of line, personal idiosyncracies, habits of composition, and so on. Though he belongs to the ages what part of him belongs to us? With Gris, who is so close to us in time and in feeling, we react largely without the familiar promptings which history provides in abundance for Botticelli. The very absence of an orthodox idiom is arresting and intrinsically affecting. A painting of Botticelli we correlate with a remote historical epoch; but the art of Gris is viewed at close range and no similar process of correlation takes place. Thus we sometimes speak of the latter as *living art* because it speaks with an uncommon directness to our feeling for design and color, space and time.

In attempting to equate the old and the new, what position in our cabinets

of memory do these older historical works take? Are they sacred heirlooms to be revered because they once were living, or are they co-equals with the brash newcomers? Have the years mellowed their beauty but at the same time diminished their power to move us? These are questions which tease us with a haunting persistence. We are reluctant to raise these questions because of the almost certain impossibility of giving them altogether satisfactory answers.¹

On the surface it appears that the twentieth century artist has made a sweeping rejection of all that his nineteenth century grandparent had held valuable. This will be apparent when a landscape of Corot is hung beside one of Picasso. Many similarities may be noted but the oppositions will loudly declare themselves. Corot made a lyric statement of feeling about wind and sky, the sweeping grace of willows, moist air—all sensuous experience. In the Picasso perhaps there will be only traces of these experiences or even none at all. He may have and undoubtedly does have them in a personal sense, but he does not pass them on to us. They are not valid artistic material for him. Likewise the sentimental drama of pathos found in Dickens is not artistic substance for Joyce or Kafka except as it is transformed into something for which a new name must be found. The question here raised is that of relating the realities of Corot to those of Picasso as both impinge upon us here and now.

A sense of reality in a work of art is commonly associated with sentiment. The reality of a painted landscape lies in its attractiveness for us as something familiar, or conversely, alluring by its strangeness. In fiction we are attracted to, and find reality in, characters who are like people we know or like ourselves; these are credible and elicit sentiment through imaginative play. When an artist withholds from his work this kind of involvement of sentiment, he is commonly called abstract. Such an identification of reality with a familiar type of sentiment and *Einfuehlung* is, of course, a gross use of language—useful at best for broad classification. Thus we say Corot is a realistic painter and Picasso is an abstract one. But a closer examination of the general labels is called for. Here it may be profitable to consider the work for what it achieves. A painting may project a good many "realities" in a good many ways. Projected physical reality is obviously only a carrier for more complex experiences; it is the face that launches a thousand ships.

¹ Some of these questions of historical art are considered by Bernard Wall, *Partisan Review* (September, 1948). In his "Question of Language" the matter is considered in the light of literature, but his observations are pertinent to the plastic arts.

In fact, the greatest works of art are all characterized, as has often been observed, by a notable absence of eye-deceiving nature-faking. Not even a very simple mind is long intrigued by a photographic imitation. Sparks and flames of recognition are kindled by other means than those of verisimilitude. These other means may be described as abstraction vitalized by style. Style in its deepest sense is ultimately a manifestation of physic balance and therefore is highly personal. It has only the most superficial connection with stylishness of modes or manner. Even self-consistency and integration (the elimination of improvisation) can avail little in the absence of the more essential intimate requirement of assurance, confidence and the energy they release. There are good styles and bad, but at their core is a man's assurance that what he projects is an integral segment of his identity. When this occurs a sense of reality is established; the artist is appeased and the viewer finds satisfaction. Now this satisfaction may occur whether a painting is realistic or abstract. In the one case associations are elicited, in the other not. Since the two types call out such varying responses there is inevitably a marked cleavage between old and new with corresponding dislocations of value. Picasso's painting can have little value for one seeking from him the poetic sentiment of Corot.

In his own life time Corot seems to have offered to his society little satisfaction since only toward the end of his career was much attention given him. The reality he projected came to be verified in Theocritus, in the old masters and in common pastoral experience. His sentiment was acclaimed by the photographers and celebrated by generations in popular art into our time. His *Indian Summer* mellowness was essentially conservative and traditional and made a strong appeal to a generation feeling the strains of social disruption.

In Corot's age the picture frame was a magic casement. Every painter saw through his window the fantasies of his peculiar personality. The grandiose rhetoric of Rubens, El Greco and Poussin was displaced by a kind of intimate, refined and lyrical essay, as expression receded from public halls of palaces to the refinement and intimacy of the salon. The artists of the nineteenth century were complex and intriguing personalities who revealed in their work facets of their subtle natures. Goya is ironic; Delacroix is passionate; Corot poetic; Daumier dramatic, and so on. While the autobiographic element has been commonly exploited since the Renaissance, it became more highly accentuated in the nineteenth century until Cézanne restored painting to its ancient objective mode: that is to say, Cézanne rejected romantic self-revelation. He austere brought his painting thereby closer to

the form-language employed in Classic, Gothic and Renaissance work. In the novel the same restoration took place largely in the work of Henry James who, in the same decades as Cézanne, reorientated his art according to formal and abstract conceptions always decreasing illusion of physical reality while increasing the tensions of inner forces. For the painter and the novelist, picture-frame and plot are reinterpreted. Where formerly they had been windows revealing fragments of the real world, they now became the skeletal structure of a metaphorical expression in which personal, psychological and autobiographical matters were sublimated and transformed. The individualism of the Romantics was not the blind alley so many have called it but signals of the shifting point of view recently expounded by Ortega y Gasset.² The personal coloration ("art in nature seen through a temperament") of the nineteenth century artists was the prelude to the Cubists' view that art has nothing to do with nature—at least objective physical nature. Their view asked for no shadow boxes or casement frames of any kinds to quicken and intensify the illusion because there was no illusion, only the direct and unique stuff of the artists' mind.

In modern painting is found the fullest statement of our philosophical position. From that new position the art of past times necessarily takes on a hue entirely different from what it had for our grandparents. For us it has become primitive, acquiring an exotic patina appropriate to all things remote. This patina is commonly associated with the aesthetic. So Ortega is prompted to say, "It is possible that present-day art has little aesthetic value. . . ." To circumvent the confusion resulting from the abrupt change of style in our time, an abruptness entailing a mixture of primitive and modern in contemporary art, some voices have half-seriously advocated the burning of the museums. And likewise there are those who for other reasons would, while preserving the museums, annihilate modern art by restrictions and party line discipline. The findings of recent and current policies of this nature seem to indicate negative results.

The most recent demarcation between what is historical and what contemporary was made with extraordinary decision by Picasso and Braque around 1907. Cubism, the generic term now given to the new style, was the forbidding skeleton upon which the new art was to grow. In its inception it was an uningratiating intellectual tour-de-force. It is not surprising that it was viewed by a bewildered public with dismay. Literary, moral, and philosophical critics made it a subject of much speculation. Cubism was ascribed

² "On the Point of View in the Arts," *Partisan Review* (August, 1949).

to extreme romanticism, to nihilism, to perverse emotional outlets—indeed to every destructive annihilating social and psychological impulse. The critiques of modern art were made largely from the outside by men unfamiliar with morphology of style in the plastic arts. The submergence of material objects in pictorial art, of plot and character in the novel, of melody in music, led the unwary observer to conclude that the arts, and with them our culture generally, had sunk into anarchy and nihilism. This dour judgment was often inspired by fear of change and of growth itself. It was made by men with heavy commitments to the golden age of humanism. Immersed in the concepts governing Classic and Renaissance life they assumed the unalterable operation of these concepts. It was these "Renaissance men" who undertook the task of interpreting modern art, finding in it only negations and anarchy.

Realities of life formulated from a belief in progress and a benevolent "science" are not those of the twentieth century man. For him, reality is not only multiple but infinitely fluid in that the mind is the formulator, not the interpreter, of realities. At this point historical styles in painting are useful illustration. A figure by Raphael is tangible and firmly rounded; but for Rembrandt the figure is cloudy and obscure, a creature of the atmosphere and light which is *devised by the artist*. A Picasso figure is wholly devised from within. Raphael might have understood a work of Rembrandt but the gap between Raphael's mind and that of Picasso could not have been bridged by the former. Paul Klee, when he paints an apple, cannot create the same type of image Courbet did. It was for Klee a self-evident truth that an apple had many sets of attributes: it was one thing to a hungry man, another to a Michigan fruit-grower and something else for Chardin. His own abstraction was only different from the abstraction of Courbet and Chardin and none the less valid. The modern vision was exemplified with profundity by Cézanne. To use Kafka's words, "A cage went in search of a bird." It was as though a resource of the mind, long dormant, suddenly realized itself. Instead of creating a plausible likeness of physical properties Cézanne created masses in suspended equilibrium, colors in organic relationship, lines in action. Here were prime realities, but those forged by the artist, to which Courbet had given much less thought since he had been absorbed with sensuous surface qualities. Cézanne required the eye and the mind of the observer, by sustained effort, to contemplate forces at work. He was, in truth, a primitive in a method which he had devised. This demand (for a positive act of participation) on the part of the viewer of the work was in sharp contrast with current practices in Cézanne's day when it was assumed that the artist would

produce a kind of packaged craftsmanship, instantly recognizable and easily assimilated. Modern art necessarily precipitates the viewer into a strenuous participation with its creator because there is only one "reality" available—that of the artist. His images are his own, having their origin not in some common experience but in the *uncommon* experience of the new creator. The graphing of forces in a state of tension characteristic of the new art will be noted in the dramas of Ibsen when they are seen in relationship to the "well-made" French plays or the ponderous English historical plays which Ibsen drove out of circulation. Similarly, the novels of James in which *nothing happens* except the ocean current flow of great world movements (the disequilibrium of American and British power) supplanted, as we are beginning to see, the meaty psychological Russians and the English novel of social sentiment (Dickens). Comprehensive ideas about society become the prime movers for Ibsen as for James, displacing sentiment, situation and psychological analysis. In pictorial art the comprehensive ideas are not specifically social, political or economic; they are plastic and like all ideas abstract.

These new works of the late nineteenth century and the twentieth, with their strenuousness, the concern for form, and their anti-autobiographical and, as some say, anti-humanistic qualities, are sharply at variance with their antecedents. *Modern* has become a new type of art, set off from descriptive art just as that of the Renaissance was set off from the Medieval. The vitality of the new art is its passport to recognition even for those unable to understand or sympathize with the new pictorial structures. This vitality is its profundity. It is, of course, incalculably superior in energy to the jaded naturalistic craft-art which it displaced. But its *difference* is unmistakable, so much so that the older art, which is here called *historical art*, has for us, despite its acknowledged qualities of beauty, an almost alien nature lacking that quality which St. Thomas called radiance. Architects, sculptors, painters, scene designers, poets and dramatists are more and more inclined to disregard the models of earlier centuries in evolving a new syntax of form. Contemporaries inspired by historical art look always for qualities of tension and dynamics beneath the facade, a facade that had been consistently respected by earlier men, but is now largely disregarded. This is literally the case in architecture. Here the shell of historical styles is ignored as architects study functional planning, and students of historical art, like Giedion, survey the structural materials beneath the fashionable surface of buildings.

No one can say that historical art was deficient in vitality; yet this quality is magnified or minimized according to one's predilection for modern art.

But by and large the tendency of our time is to find in historical art vitality diminished by our heightened consciousness of the new. Chardin and Courbet, despite all their luster, seem tame when confronted by Picasso and Klee. We recognize that Chardin lived his life, met its issues, asserted his faith, but Klee is close to us and *his* issues, *his* faith, we naturally identify actively with ourselves. The latter speaks our language and directs his discourse to our condition; so it is not unnatural that Chardin should occupy a place in our feelings not unlike that of an honored but not necessarily loved ancestor.

Any attempt to analyze the art of our time casts some light on the problem of historical art. As long ago as 1925 Jose Ortega y Gasset³ offered seven tendencies of the new art, observing that it tends to 1) dehumanize art, 2) to avoid living forms, 3) to see to it that the work of art is nothing but a work of art, 4) to consider art as play and nothing else, 5) to be essentially ironical, 6) to beware of sham, and hence to aspire to scrupulous realization, 7) to regard art as a thing of no transcending consequence.

Now the art of past times, which we are here calling historical art (and furthermore designating it as spent art), is commonly considered true living art because it has survived the shifting tides of fashion and taste. It is the hero of history, an inspiration to all who behold it, the most immortal of all man's achievements. But these truisms are tempered by the knowledge that the old masters establish themselves in the esteem of history to the very degree to which they disengaged themselves from the ruck of contemporary mannerisms, to the degree that they created a formidable style. A somewhat similar disengagement, or detachment from direct reporting on external phenomena, as Ortega notes, is the very core of twentieth century art. The formulation of an abstract style in our time is the final recognition that, as Goethe noted, art is art precisely because it is not nature. Our abstract style is in effect a crystalization, a freeing of art from its former mixed service. There are undoubtedly both gains and losses involved in this process. Certainly in the nineteenth century, and earlier, art had become a melange of documentation with personal embellishment of familiar and pathetic fragments of a recognizable world. Historical art served many masters—a painting was a document of a place or a person, a devotional object, a supreme work of *virtu*, a political tract or what not. Only a few masters considered their work as a disinterested expression.

The disengagement of modern art, its detachment from living forms,

³ Dehumanization of Art and Notes on the Novel, p. 14. Princeton University Press, 1948.

from the familiar and recognizable, has led many penetrating observers to the belief that it has become detached from common experience, and dwells in some Olympian and sterile purity. Observe Ortega's comment above, touching on the tendencies of our art to *consider art as play and nothing else, and to be essentially ironical, and to regard it as of no transcending importance*. It is true that the disengagement of modern art has been accompanied by a great embarrassment, having to function largely without a long established tradition. It is not a simple matter for a man to paint without models and orthodox method to help him on his way. He cannot proceed like an industrious German craftsman scrupulously imitating the processes of the old masters with all their accumulated authority. The irony and playfulness, noted by Ortega, are saving graces and have enriched contemporary expression after the self-conscious pomposities of much of the nineteenth century work. Today irony and playfulness seem not so much dominant features of our abstract art as inevitable qualities of a subjective style. Irony is a mental instrument. What is here called disengagement is liberation from the mixed obligations assumed by artists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those times the work of art had become a public confessional in which the artist unburdened the secrets of his soul—J. J. Rousseau, Beethoven, Wagner, Goya, Constable, Turner and many others will come to mind. The French, resisting this impulse to turn their hearts inside out for public perusal, became the bastion of art and the founders of the new style. The magic of form in tension displaced the magic of the expounded personality. So the drama of a cantilever supplants the sentimentality of a Swiss chalet. The impersonal energies of line and mass, revealed in inevitable tensions, took precedence over the romantic personal calligraphy of fantasy. This amounted to a new orientation of the individual who no longer found validity in his feelings about things but who now dominated things by creating his own image of them. From the predominantly passive role of recorder and interpreter he passed to the predominantly active one of creator. This was a momentous recovery of a talent for objectivity which the human mind has exercised in all ages. From a search for signs it turned to a search for symbols. Reality was now to be found less in physical appearance than in the sources of appearance, in the abstractions of energies, even as the physicist was pressing beyond what were once called primary qualities to those which could only be grasped by the abstractions of higher mathematics. Exactly in a similar way art was finding its peculiar equations. A cage went in search of a bird. As man became less certain of a permanent external reality, he became increasingly sure of his capacity to create a valid world-view through

symbols of his inherent spirituality. So symbols came to replace the empirically derived signs (tokens) bequeathed to him by his classic and Renaissance forebears.

Every generation must reevaluate and reinterpret the evidence history presents to it. History is in this sense mobile, or better yet, is undergoing constant metamorphosis. In the light of modern art the old masters will inevitably require new judgments. "One develops in one's own style only after death," again Kafka reminds us. It is only in the process of rejudgment that historical art survives antiquarianism and enters (but only to a limited degree) the forum of living art. The values of historical art are negligible or even negative when the process of judgment is dormant. The work of the great masters is often used as a barricade against living art, as when Beethoven and Bach and Mozart crowd off the programs the music of contemporaries. So modern art is conventionally treated as the poor relation of historical art. Conversely, historical art is often regarded as the inexhaustible capital of the professor and the museum director, who assumes that his riches need only be displayed correctly, i.e., "scientifically." As a result we have historical art neatly packaged and certified like any standardized commodity. This is to embalm art, not to use it, to reduce it to triviality and to falsify its basic function in life by denying it the mobility which could render it intelligible. It is not enough to describe, classify and define historical art, essential as this activity assuredly is. It may be said that historical art has validity only to the extent that contemporary art is vital. The health of our living art directly affects the great body of historical art. Like a stream of fresh water entering and leaving a vast inland lake, the fluid life of an ever renewing art keeps fresh the body of historical art. Without the replenishing of fresh waters the old become brackish and can give no life or satisfaction. For all of its insistence contemporary art is only one source, though a large and important one, of our self knowledge, but without it, there can be only superficial knowledge of the past or present.

The body of art often presents false alternatives: is Stravinsky the equal of Brahms? With the corpus of the two masters in mind a judgment seems logical and the question reasonable. Yet one may not ignore the fact that an unbreakable barrier, which may not be surmounted, lies between the two men. The world of Brahms is a traversed territory, known and loved for its familiar avenues and noble vistas. Its discovery in the nineteenth century was an experience luminous with revelation for his generation; but it becomes something else in the twentieth century. As it recedes it takes on new beauty but at the same time relinquishes its corrosive action. A metamorphosis

takes place gradually but inevitably. For us coming upon a noble monument of the past is to witness a hunger appeased, a lust satisfied. Rarely is the passion of hunger and lust communicated to us and then only when an awareness of an analogy with the currents of our own lives is made manifest. If beauty is inconsistent with corrosive action then there is no beauty in contemporary art and that quality belongs exclusively to historic art.

The particular conquests of Brahms cannot be made again. America can be discovered only once. But the hunger to discovery remains for a Stravinsky to appease as he invades a world never dreamed of by Brahms. The former does not cancel out Brahms by supplanting him in time. He may conceivably reveal a richer and more spacious landscape, but in the process he also enriches and illuminates the world which the older master brought to light. So contemporary art expends its force in two directions, in celebrating the present and in regenerating the past. Its caustic action is equated with its regenerative action. It places us in a position to view our past with relevance and security. It enables us to possess what is valid in our vanished past by effecting valid markers in the human landscape. By those markers, established by contemporary art, the achievements of a near or remote past come into perspective. Without them the remote while ever so "beautiful" becomes inarticulated and flat. In this sense Frank Lloyd Wright renders meaningful the austerities of pre-Aztec monuments in architecture. Within the flowing bloodstream lives the analogy with which we apprehend the streams that have ceased to flow. Only analogy saves historical art from death.

The analogical and metaphorical nature of art has never been widely understood, least of all in our scientific epoch. We have only recently emerged from an age that was nature-obsessed, one in which truth was persistently equated with facts. A work of art is, among other things, a physical statement, an unalterable comment in color, words or musical notations. While we recognize that these given statements may not be altered with impunity we are prone to lose sight of another factor—the mutability of the receptor which constantly reassesses the values inherent in all art. Historical art can be either the stock-in-trade of the antiquarian or the touchstone of artist and critic. In our time the enormous formal disparity between the old and the new need not work for confusion but rather prompt deep questioning of long established automatic responses.

COLLEGE FINE ARTS TODAY

By Alden F. Megrew

THROUGHOUT the ages, long before man left written records of his achievements, he created objects which have survived as artifacts, the visual remains of his culture and his state of civilization. Had this desire to express himself in architecture, sculpture, painting and the minor arts ceased at any point in man's history, his cultural story would have been a very different one, but such has never been the case; nor, very obviously, is it the case today. Of all the objects men have left behind them, of all their thoughts and accomplishments, none are recorded so clearly as the works of the artists and the men of letters. Today artists are as vociferous in their statements concerning the nature of our civilization as at any time in man's history, and they speak in almost frightening tones of clamor and violence. The men who speak thus, men like Picasso, Max Beckmann, Rouault and many others, are our prophets of warning as much as were the voices of those who spoke to the people of medieval Europe in terms of the Apocalyptic visions of the sculptures of Moissac or Bourges. Art is the visual expression of any age, the true mirror of the Gorgoneion, by which men may see themselves if they are not afraid to look.

The major question today is—what are we doing in our schools and colleges to train the eyes and hands of our young men and women that they may learn to SEE, and after their eyes are open, to interpret, not merely the representational world of visual truth, but more importantly to be able to examine the nature of that real world in terms of spiritual values? When the artist accomplishes the latter, he has turned from the relatively unimportant obviousness of subject to the vastly more important aspect which is called "content." I believe that subject is of primary concern to the artist, not however as an end in itself, which is the usual pitfall of "Sunday" artists and many laymen. The mere subject in itself has no importance unless it has assumed a place of complete preoccupation in the mind of the artist. When a particular subject so fills his mind, body and soul that it needs must by every compulsion find expression in a work of art, then either with crudity or with vast skill, the work of art will assume content and be born.

What then is content? It is that quality found in any work of art which, because of the intellectual and spiritual forces at work in its creation has

given meaning and vitality to it. Therefore this definition of subject and content must be stressed to the student at the very beginning. While one can very easily teach the student the craft of representationalism (i.e., how to reproduce the subject) his understanding of content can only come from within himself after he has acquired the intellectual and spiritual forces of true expression. I have no doubt that the true artist is born and not made. I seriously question if any college, university or art school could have or will produce through education a Michelangelo or a Picasso, for such men as these may with good fortune appear anywhere. What then is the use of art departments or art schools? The answer is almost too simple—because men need to express themselves in those areas which we call art, and because we have a rare opportunity thrown at us in our modern educational system whereby top-notch artists and teachers are readily available to all students, giving the latter the chance to acquire both technique and book-learning with a facility such as students have never had before. Whether or not the system has made the process of thinking too easy remains to be seen.

In the nineteenth century art was almost a subject of general taboo, indulged in, according to popular fancy, either by madmen or ladies of gentility who painted charming flowers on porcelain teacups. Curiously enough, history denies this ridiculous idea, for Manet, Toulouse-Lautrec, Cézanne, even Gauguin and Van Gogh came from backgrounds of high middle class respectability and in some cases, of the aristocracy. I grant that Van Gogh and Gauguin were somewhat unbalanced mentally, but certainly no more so than dozens of those stock-brokers who hurled themselves onto the Wall Street pavements during the '20's and '30's, and the artists have at least left us with a magnificent record of their struggle with life and society. By and large, artists have always found an important place in society, and the nineteenth century accepted the conservatives with alacrity even when it denied fame or recognition to the liberals and radicals.

Since the crumbling of the last vestiges of a decidedly decadent phase of the Renaissance at the end of World War I, art has again risen to a colossal degree. Young men and women have turned to the art department and the art school not simply because they have sought escape, but because they have wanted to make a statement to the world at large. Perhaps at no time since the Renaissance have so many found at least the ability to express their ideas in terms of art, even though their cries have often been weak and muffled. Certainly this is no time to strangle the babe that gives promise of Herculean achievement in the future. Not hundreds, but thousands of our young men have returned from World War II with a desire to express their

thoughts, ideas and ideals in cultural terms such as architecture, painting and sculpture.

So far the way to the wedding of science and art seems superficially obscure, yet it seems to me that fundamentally the problem is fairly clear. With the obvious rejection by contemporary architects of the ascetic simplicity of the International School of the '20's, the path is clear for a renewal of compatible relationships between the mother of the arts and her numerous offspring such as painting, sculpture and all the minor arts. The artist must learn to live with the designers of all fields or climb back into his duraluminum tower and die. But he will not die, for many younger artists are seeing new possibilities, or if you prefer, the rebirth of those same possibilities of allying the arts to everyday life, which existed in Greece and Rome, the churches and cathedrals of the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance.

Perhaps one of the greatest tragedies to befall art was the isolated Bohemianism of a few mediocre artists of the 19th century, and the resultant whimsical inanities of such men as Whistler and Ruskin. Not only has it brought many pseudo-artists and students into a temporary limelight, but it has also lulled the unwary into a false sense of artistic importance. Nevertheless, the swing towards the importance of the artist's own personality has its merits. Art always has been and probably for a long time will continue to be a major province and heritage of men, not women. Today, however, women have a new opportunity in the art world, and if we do not immediately uncover female Donatellos, Robert de Luzarches, or Picassos, we are constantly finding skilled and able teachers.

Our role then, as art historians and teachers in the creative fields is becoming clearer. Granted that we cannot produce genius, we still must recognize it when we find it. There certainly are times when a critic and historian may place undue emphasis on what he believes to be contemporary genius, and later have to swallow his pride in retraction. There is always a risk in making contemporary judgments, but it is surely better to judge and be wrong than never to judge at all. The "modern" art course which was given to us in college in the early '30's began with David and ended with Renoir. When we protested we were flatly told that the Impressionists *were* the "modern" artists. To judge anyone more recent would have been utter folly, for we must wait for Time to give us needed perspective. Had the Medici in Florence or the Doges in Venice waited with similar patience our heritage from the Renaissance would most assuredly have been a slim one. How are we to recognize and encourage even the outward vestiges of genius

except through study of the past and what we believe to be of importance to the present? Thus, it becomes evident that the art historian has a critical and vital role in presenting not only the already accepted material of the past, but must also be ready to act as referee in the tremendous arena of contemporary a.t.

Aside from the rare genius at the top of the pyramid, there is the vast middle group of students who are discovering the all compelling desire to express themselves in terms of art. To them we must give the greatest part of our attentions for they are the ones who lack the power of genius, but who hold most of the keys to the doorways of our future cultural heritage. This is the great group of competent thoughtful young painters who are going out either as free-lance artists or as teachers, or simply as educated citizens with a cultural avocation. They may never set the world afire in terms of the power of a Botticelli or a Matisse, but they are almost certain to singe the coat-tails of society. Every year our colleges and universities are turning out thousands of these young men and women, intellectually and technically equipped to speak their parts in our civilization, and it is a proven fact that their voices cannot be stilled.

Our great experiment and test is, can the college and university offer, through its diversified program, the kind of education which will equip our young artists with the intellectual background and stimulation plus the technical training in creative work which will make them artists and not merely artisans or craftsmen? Can we, as educators, by stimulating their minds, make these students capable of expressing themselves more vividly and coherently than the art school which trains the eye and hand but avoids, altogether too often, the vitalization of the mind and spirit. I believe we can do the job if and when it becomes apparent that art is as vital as, or almost more vital than any other branch of learning and productivity. Something that we must not blind ourselves to, a most obvious fact—is that our arts will always be the criterion by which we shall eventually be judged, and if we deny the right of expression to our children today the revelation of that denial will be the bitter truth of tomorrow.

Needless to say there is likewise the question—of what must an adequate art department consist? Today the stress is almost entirely upon painting and the graphic arts, various aspects of commercial and industrial design and sculpture. All of these must be represented and stressed with approximately equal weight in any well-balanced department. Besides this and of equal importance is the role that the art historians must play. Their job is to offer not only general but also detailed courses which give intellectual

stimulation, a sound understanding of man's cultural heritage, and a consciousness of quality and selectivity which inherently and instinctively becomes an actual part of every student's life. In order to bring true realization of what great art is, every department should plan to bring exhibitions to the campus, exhibitions varying from print shows to perhaps only a single masterpiece. Examples of second-rate or "Sunday" painting will do far more damage than good, and should be avoided, except in the event of developing local interest. Today it is possible to borrow great art, old or contemporary, for often only transportation charges, and by arranging circuits the cost can be reduced to a minimum of a few dollars.

The areas of painting, sculpture, history of art, etc., for an adequate department are already recognized and established in all art schools and most colleges and universities offering majors in the Fine Arts field, but none have yet realized the importance of allying all these arts either to the history of architecture or to contemporary architectural design. Too many historians discuss glibly the sculptures of a great Gothic cathedral as if they were so many statues in alcohol-filled jars on the shelves of some medical museum, and they discuss the mural paintings of Raphael and Michelangelo as if they were suspended in mid-air. So long as this divorce system exists among the historians, who in turn teach the would-be creative artists, we can scarcely expect the monumental concepts and architectonic relationships which always have been and must soon again be the heritage of great artistic expression and accomplishment. In other words, the art historian must be a scholar, cognizant of the facts, but on top of this he must have an emotional approach of sufficient warmth and enthusiasm to give him interpretive ability. As empathy must exist between a great painting and its observer, so the lecturer must be able to produce in his students an empathic response to the slide projected upon the screen.

The training of too many of our art historians in the last twenty-five years has been that of the walking factual encyclopedia, whose information and knowledge can be derived much more peacefully from the library shelf than during uncomfortable hours seated in stuffy lecture rooms. Another of our great weaknesses in art history has been the tendency of the lecturer to recite lists of dates, names of artists, sizes of pictures and where they hang, completely losing sight of the far more important aspect of the relation of the art object to the total cultural pattern which produced it. To teach art history in such a manner, giving no thought to historical, economic, sociological, philosophical and other culture pattern allusions seems to me utterly senseless and meaningless.

Another vitally important aspect in our fine arts programs, and undoubtedly our weakest link, is in the field of art teaching in elementary and secondary school, both public and private. Today there is scarcely a college or university in the United States that does not offer an art major. At the same time there are practically no schools offering any real preparation for college level art. Under the present system in most states, where specialized art teachers are a luxury item practically never hired for more than part-time teaching, there is little hope of expecting that students will reach college level with any real background.

Furthermore, the inadequate and antiquated concepts existing in far too many education departments have caused thinking students to shrink from becoming part of a system which demands conformation rather than original creative expansion. The tragedy has been and still is, that the better students, if they plan to go into the fine arts professionally, want to teach at college or university level, where they can continue their intellectual and spiritual growth; and the weaker students are willing to forego further creative development and fall into a pattern of intellectual stultification. Even worse than the student attitude has been the fact that some of our major universities, have made the M.A. in Art Education a terminal degree and shunted their less bright students into this educational dead end.

Still another variable of our contemporary system, especially in public schools and far too many of our institutions of so-called "higher learning" is the bug-bear of degrees. Many of our colleges demand the doctor's degree, not because it is the badge of the true teacher, but because it looks well to have a liberal sprinkling of "doctors" on the staff. Unfortunately the doctor's degree in too many aspects of the "arts" has become a mark of questionable distinction for many men and women who have little or no conception of what real teaching means. To me, one of the greatest satisfactions in teaching is the relation of teacher to student. We must spend many tedious and patient hours coaching and encouraging the mediocre and the slow, and we must stimulate the good and brilliant minds toward further enlightenment and activity. I grant that such contacts with students is difficult under our present crowded conditions, but I know from experience, that it is not impossible. Let us hope the day will come when the Ph.D. will perhaps be divided into two categories, the Ph.D. in teaching and the Ph.D. in research. Today there is no place to which one can go to find a teacher as such, and I firmly believe that it is time to revise our system in such a manner that part of the requirements for the doctor's degree for those who want to teach will be actual experience in teaching. Nowadays most of our larger institutions offer grad-

uate assistantships, a plan established to attract better students with little money, to give them an opportunity to carry on their studies and creative work beyond the undergraduate level. We select only the best students for these assistantships and then give them no academic credit as a reward for their ability. By the time a man has decided to take the Master of Fine Arts degree he has usually also decided that this will be his chosen professional field, and his talent for teaching should then become one of his major objectives. I sincerely hope that the day will not be too far in the future when we can say not only "Here is a man soundly trained in the art and craft of his profession, but also one who has earned his degree by demonstration of his ability to teach others." We desperately need this approach.

In relation to this system and applying to the undergraduate is the serious situation regarding too many of our art departments in colleges and universities, who are losing sight of their most important function—that is that the department is not primarily a professional school but rather a department functioning within the college of liberal arts and subject to its established academic rules. While the distinction between the B.A. as a regular major and the B.F.A. allowing more concentration in the Fine Arts area is a thoroughly valid one, I do believe that we should be extremely careful in our selection of B.F.A. candidates and limit permission to try for the B.F.A. to those who show much greater than average ability. At the same time B.F.A. candidates should not be permitted to think of themselves in professional capacity, and should be encouraged to take as many academic courses as their schedules will permit. Too much concentration in the Fine Arts, as in any other field, will only produce narrowness instead of breadth of vision.

The aims of our Fine Arts departments, then, are these. First of all I believe that we owe to our students the right and opportunity of becoming creative artists either for purposes of vocation or avocation. For the latter, perhaps the larger and in some respects the more important group, we should send out of our educational institutions a great number of young men and women with a keen awareness of the pleasures of creative experience in one or more branches of the fine arts, plus a broad knowledge of art history both old and new. Such a background will always be a source of intellectual and creative experience to enrich their lives and that of the whole community. To those who chose art as an avocation, I believe we owe nothing professionally. They may go out into their communities as nurses or librarians, mechanics or businessmen, and their lives should be all the richer and more enjoyable for the knowledge and creative talent which they have

acquired. For those who chose the fine arts as a vocation we must offer far more experience in the craft aspect of all the fine arts and far more detailed study of art history, plus the opportunity to experience the actual art of teaching, so that they may go out, not as scholars or artists or teachers—as such, but with the true teacher's attitude of having learned much but always seeking to learn more. Let me repeat once again the vital necessity, especially where the unusually talented student is concerned, in guiding and encouraging him in every possible way. To try to lay down any rules for the stimulation of genius is not possible, for it is bound to be a completely individual problem which will not conform to any specific pattern. Again the only solution to the teacher's understanding of such rare individuals can come from his personal contact with his students, and never through the mass production system.

In conclusion it becomes rather apparent that the whole field of the Fine Arts is faced with a dual role: first to develop within the average student a knowledge of his heritage that may be applicable to a broader existence, which in turn will enrich not only his individual life, but by extension, the entire life of the community. By carrying this philosophical ideal to its ultimate conclusion in the distant future, it even becomes possible to envision a world dominated by such rich cultural ideals. Secondly we are faced with the problem of stimulating the future professional leaders both in art itself and in the teaching of art. While the training of art teachers for the college and university levels is now being handled in a serious and competent fashion, it is time that we revise and revitalize our concepts of the role of the fine arts teacher in the school systems. Let us force a break with the overwhelming emphasis on crafts and teach school children not only how to DO with their hands, but more importantly, how to CREATE with their heads and hearts. The children will learn fast and create well when they are led by teachers who encourage them along the lines of original creative thinking instead of merely copying and imitation. Surely this is a serious obligation, for the cultural designs which we lay down for them must inevitably become the basis of their intellectual and creative approach, and if we fail to give them a firm foundation on which to build their own ideals, we shall also have failed those who must study with them. In other words, both the general students and the professional students in the fine arts, in course of time, become the cornerstones and keystones of our cultural heritage. This idea certainly presupposes a vast responsibility on the part of every fine arts department in the country, a responsibility which we must recognize with great immediacy or leave a tragic picture for future archaeologists of the inadequacy and failure of our culture.

THE CORRELATION OF LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS¹

By Blanche R. Brown

IN TOO many of our schools today, the various acts and achievements of man through the ages are taught separately, as though each were a unique accident. A student might at one time be studying Egypt in his history class, Victor Hugo in his French class, Shakespeare in his English literature class, and how to draw bittersweet in a vase in his art class—or, if his art department is "advanced," how to appreciate Picasso and poured-concrete bridges. Another month he may be occupying himself with Medieval history, Voltaire, Steinbeck, and Michelangelo. And another month with the French Revolution, André Gide, Chaucer, and Ben Shahn.

There is a very good chance that most of these students will ripen, mature, fade, and die without ever understanding that Karnak and Deir-el-Bahri are the aesthetic concretions of the bronze-age absolutisms of Temple and Lord, and a new humanism breathes in both art and literature during the reign of the heretic pharaoh Akhnaton. They will not know that the classical poetry and painting of China are twin products of the same delicate, entrenched, aristocratic culture, and that the same impulses produced Goldsmith's "Deserted Village" and the nostalgic pastorales of Gainsborough, Turner's interpretation of the romance and mystique of nature and Wordsworth's. They will not realize that Delacroix, Sir Walter Scott and Victor Hugo were contemporaries as well as Burne-Jones and Tennyson, Daumier and Dickens, Zola and the Impressionists, Descartes and Poussin, Calderon de la Barca and Velasquez, Voltaire and Goya, Mallarmé and Gauguin, Theodore Dreiser and John Sloan, John Steinbeck and Ben Shahn, James Joyce and Pablo Picasso.

Now, the threads of economics, politics, music, literature, painting, and architecture are scattered and tangled like the wool after the kitten got at it. Actually, the history of man and his works is not as chaotic and capricious as we have made it seem. The threads can be interwoven into a quite comprehensible, and a very rich, pattern.

If students could be taught Georgian England, the architect James Gibbs and the composer Franz Josef Haydn, the writer Richardson and the painter

¹ From a paper delivered at the 39th annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English held in Buffalo, Nov. 22-26, 1949.

Hogarth, all together and interdependently, how much more they would know! Or the *ancien régime* of the later Louis, the Petit Trianon, Rameau, Boucher, and Pierre de Marivaux. Or a post-Civil War America that gave rise not only to railroads and factories, but also to Whitman, Twain, Howells, Eakins and Homer, the constructions of Roebling, and the skyscrapers of Sullivan. When you add one such item to another it does not give a simple sum of two items learned. Rather, it multiplies the significance of what is learned.

I have been emphasizing the fact that by such methods one can achieve an integrated understanding of the history of man, which is not an unimportant aim. Let me add that by such methods one can also multiply the aesthetic understanding of the intrinsic values of the work of art itself by comparisons that emphasize the unifying spirit of the time, and by contrasts that emphasize the unique expressiveness of each art form, and each art object.

I say all of this simply to define what I consider to be our area of agreement, to state the problem that concerns us all here, before going on to suggest possible solutions. Perhaps some day we shall have co-ordinated curricula in the schools and then everything will be simple. Some more or less complete co-ordinations have already been made, of which you undoubtedly know many more examples than I. In such a presentation, museums can play an important part, both in the independent presentation of their collections, and in materials prepared in co-operation with the schools. The following is a sample of what we at the Metropolitan Museum of Art have done in the educational field and plan to do in the future.

First, we have organized a series of educational exhibits within the Museum in order to enrich the enjoyment of our own collections, one of which was on "Comparisons in American Art and Literature." It consisted of a series of parallels juxtaposed, the work of painting or sculpture placed next to an excerpt from a comparable work of literature, with a short label to explain what the point of the comparison was. Perhaps the simplest way to describe this exhibition is to give you a listing of the comparisons made:

To illustrate the sensible point of view during colonial times—a portrait by John Singleton Copley, and axioms from Poor Richard's Almanac.

For Revolutionary propaganda—Paul Revere's print of the Boston massacre and Tom Paine's "The Crisis."

In celebration of the New Republic—"The Battle of Bunker Hill" by John Trumbull, and the "Columbiad" of Joel Barlow.

For the Romantic attitude toward nature—a Hudson River School landscape by Thomas Cole, and the beginning of "Thanatopsis" by William Cullen Bryant.

In the Gothic mood of Romanticism—"The Deluge" by Washington Allston and "The Conqueror Worm" by Edgar Allen Poe.

For the simple genre attitude—"Raffling for the Goose" by William S. Mount, and "Snowbound" by John Greenleaf Whittier.

Out of the Mississippi frontier—George Caleb Bingham's "Jolly Flatboatmen" and Mark Twain's "Life on the Mississippi."

The post-Civil War period began with "The Music Lesson" by John G. Brown, a very saccharine little number, which was compared with an equally sugary passage from "Prudence Palfry" by Thomas Bailey Aldrich.

The beginnings of realism—"The Veteran," an early Winslow Homer, and the "Return of the Private" by Hamlin Garland.

A stronger statement on the environment—"The Gross Clinic" by Thomas Eakins, and "The Wound Dresser" by Walt Whitman.

The romance of the frontier—the late painting by Winslow Homer, "Shooting the Rapids, Saguenay River" and Jack London's "Call of the Wild."

The stereotyping of the Western hero—a statuette of a cowboy by Frederic Remington, and Owen Wister's "The Virginian."

The sensitive expatriate—Whistler's "Cremorne Gardens No. 2" and Henry James' "Louisa Pallant."

The native aesthete—"Moonlight Marine" by Albert Pinkham Ryder and a quite amazingly appropriate poem by Emily Dickinson which begins, "It tossed and tossed, a little brig I knew, o'ertook by blast, It spun and spun, And groped delirious, for morn."

Early Twentieth Century naturalism—William Glackens' "Shop Girls," and Theodore Dreiser's "Sister Carrie."

The glorification of the common man—a sculpture by Mahonri Young called "Man with a Pick," and a poem "The Rock-Breaker" by Edwin Markham.

A water color of a drab small-town Main Street by Charles Burchfield was compared with Sherwood Anderson's "Winesberg, Ohio."

"One Third of a Nation," a social realist painting by Louis Guglielmi with the living newspaper play "One Third of a Nation."

An abstract water color of the Maine coast by John Marin, with "Voyages" by Hart Crane, again a comparison that works almost mood for mood and image for image.

A Neo-Romantic painting, "The Black Horse" by John Atherton, with "The Waste Land" by T. S. Eliot.

A non-objective painting, "Prescience" by Charles Howard, with Gertrude Stein's "An Acquaintance with Description."

It is now planned to publish this exhibit in full, with all the art illustrated some time within the next year. There can be more such exhibits and publications which could be circulated so that you could have them in your schools and colleges. There are some such travelling exhibits available now. On the whole they are more likely to give a period setting for your literature than a direct art-to-literature comparison, but they are none the less valuable. The *Life* magazine exhibits for example, serve this purpose.

In the Metropolitan Museum we make up a series of exhibits, including original art objects, which we circulate in the public senior and junior high schools of New York City. The high school shows are planned primarily to illustrate the study of history, but by providing a period setting they are often useful in the teaching of literature too. Just now we circulate exhibits on "The Living Past of China," "Medieval Life," and "America from 1620 to 1820." A new one on "The Living Past of Greece" is just finished, and the next one will be on 19th century Europe. We send teaching aids along with these, such as movies, canned slide lectures, related music on records, etc., so that the correlations are made as clear and multifaceted as possible.

We also give special programs in the Museum for high school students. These happen on Saturday mornings, eight each semester. They come in three parts: a lecture, a visit to the galleries, and a related movie. We send tickets out to the schools, and the students come of their own volition. These programs also are arranged to coincide with the school curriculum. We have some for language students, some for social studies students, one for home economics students, and the following for literature students:

There is a program on "The Age of Chivalry," intended to give a period setting for such neo-medieval reading as "Ivanhoe" or "Idylls of the King," and one called "Myths of the Greeks and Romans, Illustrated in their Art," which is a direct illustration of studies in classical mythology. The others present historic correlations between literature and art. There are "Pictures and Words in Eighteenth Century England," with the movie "Berkeley Square," and "Art Backgrounds of the Romantic Poets," in which we actually sneak in the Romantic movement in general, in art and literature, and use either "Jane Eyre" or "Camille" as the related movie. We expect to add one on "Dickens and 19th Century Realism," with "Great Expectations" as the movie. And there is also one on "Comparisons in American Art and Literature," which covers some of the ground already described perhaps over-fully in relation to the exhibit on the same topic.

In addition we have the old standard services, quite routine in most museums now, which are easily adaptable to the presentation of correlative studies. During school days we offer guided tours of the collections to school

classes, which also are expected to be used in specific connection with school studies. These are one-hour lectures, illustrated by original art objects in the Museum's collections, given by a staff lecturer, whose time is reserved in advance. The appointments are made sometimes singly, sometimes in a series. Just now, for example, we have two high school classes in World Literature, which some once every two weeks through the school year, beginning with Greece in September, and winding up with the twentieth century in June. And we have given a series of gallery lectures to a class which was taking a combined course in modern history and literature.

For materials which can be used outside the Museum in the school, there are the Lending Collections, where slides, photographs, and colored reproductions can be selected and borrowed. These can be had also in sets, and there are a certain number of what we ungallantly call "canned lectures" in which a lecture script accompanies the slide set. We are thinking of making some lectures which are even more canned, with the talk recorded, and the illustrations set in a film strip, and we want to plan them very carefully to be useful to teachers of history, languages, and literature.

We are trying very earnestly to meet the needs of teachers, and we hope to do much more and better. Museums by this year in the history of man are quite generally convinced that they must function creatively in the community as educational institutions, but they do not always know precisely what is needed. I think they will be grateful if the teachers tell them. We now have a direct connection with the city Board of Education, including a liaison man assigned by the Board to work with the Museums of the city, and one assigned by the Museum to work with the schools. This has proved a sound working arrangement. If I may say so without seeming overly romantic, teachers and museums need each other.

THE CORRELATION OF LITERATURE WITH ARCHITECTURE¹

By Francis Shoemaker

AMONG writers and critics of architecture, I am not alone in the fact that I am not a professional architect and can make no claim for special knowledge in this field. But for the past six months I have lived in a house which Mrs. Shoemaker and I helped to design and build. Some interesting things have happened in that time. Two five-year-old girls came to the door uninvited and said, "This is a pretty house; may we come in?" A Columbia University professor said, "This house implies a whole new way of looking at life." And a University law student, looking at the free-flowing uncluttered living-space, asked in innocent seriousness, "Do you find that you treat your wife any better since you've lived here?"

Such comments have made me realize that architecture "speaks" in moving "language" about human values. It is this use of the word "language" that I would like us to analyze in this paper. To what extent is the metaphor a logical one? Are the purposes, the materials, the methods, and the individual-social consequences of literature and architecture sufficiently comparable to justify continued use of the metaphor? Is it possible that metaphorical logic, applied here as a theory of inquiry, will lead us to a fuller understanding of the relationships of these two arts—and perhaps of other arts as well?

The linguistic-architectural metaphor, of course, is not new. Many of us have used it in various ways. We have taught both literature and composition using the architectural analogy of foundation, framework and integral roof structure. We have taught types of literature and kinds of writing in the same spirit and using the same vocabulary as the architectural critic who writes that "the rules of composition applicable to architecture . . . are balance, rhythm, good proportion, climax, harmony, and functional expression of both purpose and structure."²

In both of these approaches, it seems to me, we have looked at "composition" as a completed fact rather than as a process. Balance, rhythm, propor-

¹ One of a series of meetings dealing with varied resources for the teaching of English. Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Hotel Statler, Buffalo, New York, Nov. 22-26, 1949.

² Hamlin, Talbot, *Architecture—An Art for All Men*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1947, p. 72.

tion, climax, harmony, etc., are qualities that a book or a building *has* when it is finished. They have had little to do with the creative process through which an individual interacts with his environment. They tell us little about the social consequences of the new pattern of values symbolized in this interaction.

The Humanities, as a teaching field, led many of us in the 1930's—and since—closer to understanding literature and architecture as symbols of culture. In Humanities courses, we used world literature as a unifying center for the patterns of life in successive epochs in Western culture. We drew parallels, for instance, between Greek drama and Greek architecture; we compared the structural patterns of the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, Dante's *Divine Comedy*, and the Gothic cathedral. Whether we interpreted the Gothic form as aspiration toward Divine Mind or as the narrow vaulted catacomb risen confidently above ground—or a combination—is important here only to show that we had begun to think of contemporaneous works of art as symbolic formulations of human values—as expressions of a prevailing world view. At the same time, many teachers of the Humanities continued their emphasis on the "basic aesthetic principles" of balance, rhythm, proportion, etc. observable in the finished symbols of any earlier epoch than our own. Since the war, however, our attention has shifted toward *today's* art as mediums of communication—and hence, as agents in the evolution of the culture of which they are a part. This recognition of the importance of contemporary arts is wholesome. But if we are to move beyond recognition to ways to correlate our use of varied arts, we will need a more "verbal" (i.e. active) terminology to describe them. We will need words which describe the conscious process through which the individual artist, whether author or architect, interacts with his environment to create a satisfying harmonization of values for himself and his contemporaries. But we do not need to invent new terms. They are implied in the metaphor of the "language" of the arts. They are terms now commonly used by both "language artists" and architects—to describe the internal disciplines through which they shape the vocabularies of their respective mediums. The terms are rhetoric, grammar, and logic.

I do not think of these disciplines as separate devices or rules of procedure to be used respectively for persuasion, expression and proof. I see them as simultaneously interactive, one upon the other, whether in the process of architectural construction or the process of literary composition. At this point, though, we need a close-up of each to recognize their modern meanings in both architecture and literature.

As I said before, I do not think of rhetoric as rules for embellishing language to persuade or convince. This idea of rhetoric seems to be giving way gradually to a modern rhetoric which I. A. Richards describes as "the discipline of 'sorting' the various modes of expression" in order to choose one appropriate to a given situation. The mode chosen—reminiscence or forecast, gentle rebuke or caustic satire, journalistic report or purple passage, etc.—is largely determined by the mood of the communicator and his attitude toward his audience. Take this sentence from page one of Lloyd Douglas' *The Big Fisherman*:

"Viewed from the main entrance to the King's encampment the undulating plateau was a rich pasture on which a thousand newly shorn sheep, indifferent to the rough nuzzling of their hungry lambs, grazed greedily as if some instinct warned that there might be a famine next season."

I think I sense the architectural counterpart of this kind of rhetoric in the current construction of the house of a financially successful lumber dealer whom I know. It is a Cape Cod cottage—with six bedrooms, five baths, four marble fireplaces, and a two-car garage. It is built of three-quarter inch plywood, covered with first quality British Columbia redwood, painted white.

It is difficult, as I suggested earlier, to draw the line between the mode of expression, or its rhetoric, and the word order of the expression, or its grammar. In the English language, grammar is the description of the way words cooperate with one another in their contexts—as I. A. Richards, C. C. Fries, or Aileen Kitchen have ably demonstrated. The grammar of architecture is essentially the same; it describes the process of achieving "cooperation of materials in context" to express a fundamental attitude toward life. But the vocabulary of the architect is not the linguistic symbol S-T-O-N-E or W-O-O-D that he uses in naming materials for his client. His vocabulary, as Frank Lloyd Wright uses the term, is the structural quality peculiar to stone, or steel, or glass, or wood, visualized and sensualized in interrelationship with one another in the context of a building. The architect "speaks" through consciously patterned cooperation of the textures, colors, and shapes of his materials.

In our house, for instance, hollow-center walls provide gray limestone both outside and inside the house. Inside, the grammar calls for many places where soft-grained mahogany plywood joins the rough-textured limestone. The grammar then calls for meticulous scribing of the wood to follow the contour of the stone—and in so doing, dramatizes the effect of their contrasting vocabularies. Similarly, where colorless plate glass forms the south

wall, the glass is set in Douglas fir frames. The red colored wood gives a rhythmic softness to what would otherwise be an unresolved tension as hard glass and hard stone met in relatively characterless cement.

And so we come to logic. Obviously there is little place for syllogistic logic among these disciplines which grow from psychological responses to the vocabularies of language and architecture. A logic consistent with the interactive rhetoric-grammar we have been talking about involves a method or discipline for patterning rhetorically selected, grammatically organized vocabularies. That's fairly complicated. Let me say it another way. Any good thing we do results from conscious planning. Logic is the discipline through which we plan the overall arrangement of cooperating materials, selected for the purpose of expressing an attitude toward some part of our environment.

The logic of a book or a building, if we accept this definition, determines, and is determined by, the artist's philosophy or pattern of values. The more profoundly the author or architect explores the personal-social implications of the emergence of the new knowledge of his culture, the more thoroughly and appropriately his logic-grammar-rhetoric will symbolize his culture. To test out this theory, let us pick one idea which cuts through every phase of modern life—and then examine the way literature and architecture "discuss" it in their respective vocabularies.

One pervasive idea to examine is that of "simultaneity." Simultaneity! By that I mean the tight interrelatedness of modern society that gives immediate and multiple significance to any single event. I mean also the unnumbered isolated events which impinge upon our conscious and unconscious selves, but which we have yet to draw into significant relationship. The idea of simultaneity has grown from many sources: mathematicians recognize it as the "dimension of space-time"; Gestalt psychologists as the "field theory"; doctors as "psychosomatic medicine"; anthropologists as "culture pattern"; ecologists as the "interplay of geographic and intellectual climates"; and educators think of it as the development of the whole child as a cooperative individual.

But for great numbers of people "simultaneity" as explained by these specialists remains unintelligible. It is only in the arts that the human significance of the abstract idea is both *known* and *felt*. *Manhattan Transfer*, for instance, first made me aware of it. The logic of Dos Passos' book was not chronological; instead, the organization into its 133 sections showed as many segments of urban life bombarding the life of Jimmy Herf. And what about *The Grapes of Wrath*? Doesn't Steinbeck's unique chapter pattern suggest the simultaneousness of 600,000 Joad histories in rural America? George

Stewart's *Storm* speaks even more boldly. Stewart shifts the reader's observation point 129 times in 12 days, symbolizing in this logic or organization, the simultaneity of events in both urban and rural areas around the world. And in architecture? The growing city itself, second only to language as man's most complex invention, is the outstanding sample. But it is too vast for one person to comprehend—as *Life* magazine's recent schematic cross sections of Manhattan suggest. But in Radio City within New York, we can see an architect's design for translating "simultaneity" into living space. Each of the RCA building's 87 stories, houses many interests, occupations, plans, hopes, human lives. At the same time the logic of the building which provides for their interrelationship can be understood only as one observes the building from all its sides and from the air.

Thus far our applications of rhetoric-grammar-logic in literature and architecture have been made with random selections. In conclusion, I'd like to focus on the approach to "simultaneity" in the work of two men, Carl Sandburg and Frank Lloyd Wright. From an abbreviated regional or ecological approach, we see that they are both from the Mid-west—the Great Lakes Basin Region; they were both Chicago men in the time of John Peter Altgeld; they were both Wisconsin men in the time of the elder Bob LaFollette. One called Chicago "Hog Butcher for the World. . . . City of the Big Shoulders"; the other led the "Chicago school" of architecture. Each in the vocabulary of his medium says, "The People, Yes." One has written *Remembrance Rock*;³ the other has built his Taliesin and Taliesin Fellowship School on the bedrock and of native stone of Wisconsin. The structures, I think, are comparable in purpose, and in materials and methods and individual-social consequences.

Sandburg began *Remembrance Rock* in the early 1940's, amid the world atmosphere of foreboding, but with the confidence of one who knows the importance of his methods for social action. We sense both foreboding and confidence in the pervasive name choices—Windom, Windrow, Winshore, Wimbler, Winwold, Wilming, Williams, Wayman. We sense them too in the falling cadences of carefully constructed sentences.

"For we know when a nation goes down and never comes back, when a society or a civilization perishes, one condition may always be found. They forgot where they came from. They lost sight of what brought them along. The hard beginnings were forgotten and the struggles farther along. They became satisfied with themselves."³

He proceeds then, through organization of more than a million filed

³ Sandburg, Carl, *Remembrance Rock*, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1948, p. 19.

items, to recreate the pasts of Plymouth, Providence, Valley Forge, and Gettysburg in the immediate consciousness of one young man. He does this by writing three historical novels within the larger framework of *Remembrance Rock*. The historical novels contain the story of the American dream written in the author's studio retreat for his battle-fatigued grandson, that after Guadalcanal he may take new life from our visions and hopes and hard beginnings. Through this logic Sandburg makes his central character, Raymond Windom, conscious of the many historical forces operating in our complex modern life. As Raymond reads, we observe him summing up in his personality the crises which form the supporting arches of democracy; he gains repose; he regains—and we with him—the will to confront life, to give it order and meaning within a cooperative design.

It seems to me that Mr. Wright's "Taliesin" also speaks to us in a note of high seriousness about the vistas of hope and happiness that man can develop for himself if he preserves a *place* to put his roots down in native soils and a *time* for nourishing his sense of self. Out of this rhetorical attitude and understanding, he conceives a structure in local field stone and local timber, following the land's contours inconspicuously around (not over) the brow of a hill, and providing a wide prospect from the almost cave-like security of the living space. From this conception he moves to blue-print and construction. In the grammatical interplay of wood, stone, glass, he creates and then harmonizes tensions of line and texture to produce a sense of utter repose. At the same time, the logic of the house provides for this repose for many individuals who may simultaneously want to read, play or listen to music—or for many individuals who may want simultaneously to come together to share music or conversation about things that matter.

Mr. Wright's design for Broad Acre City envisions this kind of individual-social pattern for all America. We could wish for its accomplishment to parallel the release to all America of the motion picture version of *Remembrance Rock*.

We all need more study, more experience, more trials and errors with what Lewis Mumford calls the art of "simultaneous thinking," before we can "read" both literary and architectural symbols of our culture. I think, though, that we may have a promising beginning in a linguistic vocabulary—rhetoric-grammar-logic, and numerous other terms yet unexplored in their 20th century meanings—which describes the symbolic process in these arts, and perhaps in music, painting, and the dance.

THE TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR GENERAL MUSEUM WORK

By Edgar C. Schenck

THE transition from being educated in general to being trained for a specific job comes gradually, as I remember, but after a short time one becomes aware of a change from the somewhat leisurely pace of undergraduate courses with the inevitable assimilation by bull-session to the forced draft of preparing for a graduate examination. There was a delightful sense of eternity to the rhythm of undergraduate learning which ranged from the peaks of—shall we say Great Books—to the valleys of Hollywood social studies. One rarely knew where one was going, but the controlled drifting was pleasant and immeasurably valuable.

The change from this to the preparation to meet the more exacting standards of graduate study was as nothing compared to the shock of finding one's self on the other side of the desk expected to furnish information to a viciously apathetic group of students whose upturned faces and skeptical eyes caused them to lose, for a moment, any resemblance to familiar human form. It was as less than nothing to the paralysis of being faced in a museum gallery with the childlike insistent question of any museum audience, "Why is that art?" In both cases the files of mental notes and the reams of painfully acquired facts had to be immediately and forcibly rearranged for presentation in a form quite different from the neat and confident lecture notes already assembled.

Perhaps that one white moment of illumination is enough training for a teacher or an educational worker in a museum. Perhaps the sudden realization that a teacher in either field has more to do than to organize facts in a vacuum is worth the shock. Perhaps the experience with all of its implications is the only way to make that realization one's own. But in any case, no matter how well educated or broadly informed he is, it is too often the only training the teacher gets.

There are other facets of museum work where that particular shock is not so great. I mention this because it is the most obvious and points up most clearly the axiomatic difference between education and training which we might belabor here for a moment. Training is obviously more specific and

directed toward teaching a man to do a certain piece of work. It is concerned with what we like to call "know-how"—tricks of technique or special methods. Training makes the good mechanic, the good banker or the good craftsman. Education, on the other hand, is an affair of the mind of forming and deepening those channels to understanding which gives later training a meaning. In Plato's more archaic vein it is concerned with teaching a man "rightly how to rule and how to obey" or in that author's strikingly modern words to teach him "eagerly to pursue the ideal perfection of citizenship."

The teacher in the educational system faced with those apathetic faces has a firm and powerful ally in the fact that our infernal grading system gives him the upper hand in the end. He is perhaps the worse for using the club, but at least he can indulge in the luxury of saying, as I have heard him say and with justification, that it is ridiculous to ask him to teach a freshman class to which seniors are admitted—"Their backgrounds are so different."

At least the unlimited cut system does not extend so far that his audience will walk out on him if he doesn't catch their attention in the first few minutes of the class. The museum lecturer must somehow bridge the gaps in capacity to understand without distorting the facts or standing on his head as he talks. It is a training problem which has no consistent solution. It is easier for the college or school teacher to *learn his trade*, I think. The pattern is a bit clearer at the moment. He may—and sometimes, I'm afraid, does—perform his work of illumination without ever touching on how a thing is made. The ideas behind it are his main and often his only concern. His teaching is on a level which can assume technical competence in a work of art. There is in museum work the unsettling factor of a general public which colors (and I believe *should* color) the attitude of the most scholarly curators. This public has a right to springboards, if you will, from which it can take the plunge at various levels of understanding.

The special divisions of museum work, as they now exist, have grown up quite naturally around the functions of the museum as these functions have been interpreted and reinterpreted from time to time—they are essentially to collect, preserve and present tangible unique objects. Life in a museum would be relatively simple without the third function. One could group the problems of research and criticism around the collection of objects and the problems of housing and care around the second and we could all retire to our studies to write books. Yet it is precisely the problem of presentation which has been the motive power for the astonishing growth in museums during the last few years. It has permeated all the nooks and crannies of our museum buildings, often causing radical changes of approach

in the functions of collection and preservation and, at the very least, has been responsible for an uneasy questioning of purpose. Have we "done those things which we ought not to have done and left undone those things which we ought to have done" and is there any health in us?

To my mind there is no question as to the ideal education and training for the general museum worker. He should first of all be a scholar with the capacity for continuous intellectual growth. He should be taught to know more than anyone else about something. He should be given a broad knowledge of the techniques of art and architecture even to the point of being a well-known practitioner in one or more of them. He should know the principles of design and be able to apply them in installation or typography. He should be trained to be an engaging writer with a particular flair for catching eternity in a label. He should be able to decide at a moment's notice whether the broken-down ghost of a painting brought to him is an unrecorded Giotto and how much the family can realize on it. He should be trained to clean varnish and dirt from it and retouch it without losing the quality of the original. He should know when to stop cleaning. He should be taught how to read a balance sheet and to work within a budget in his department. He should be given the ability to get things done in his office without injuring the human feelings of the very human material with which he is working. He should be told how to develop a news sense as well as a feeling for public relations. (A remarkable memory for names and faces is essential here and it *can* be developed.) He should be a dynamic speaker either from a prepared manuscript for occasions like these or from notes and should leave any audience with the irresistible urge to carry the subject further on its own. He should strive to achieve a warm and pleasant personality with possibly some charming eccentricity by which he can be easily identified and he ought to be told to marry an attractive wife.

Fortunately, perhaps, this paragon doesn't exist. Trustees would soon be impoverished and city treasuries emptied under the delightful charm of such an assault. Short of such well-trained people, the ideal would certainly be a group of highly trained specialists in every department who knew enough of the inter-related fields to know when to keep hands off and how to work most effectively both *with* and *for* others. Some of the larger museums may even approach this ideal, but they are in the minority, I am sure. I have no panacea to offer for producing such a team of specialists but I question whether they can be produced by pre-training in colleges or graduate schools offering specialized degrees. Do we not run the danger here of limiting the specialties—of freezing them into a mold so that what interplay that exists

between them today would disappear with the Doctor of Museology degree? Even where a professional standard is established a wide familiarity with the field comes first. One is first a Doctor of Medicine and only later a heart specialist.

Is not the plan sound (to paraphrase Mr. Rich and Mr. Sachs at a similar conference some years ago) to leave education to the universities and training to museums? Education is, after all, an academic problem. At the same time, may we not hope that, as an undergraduate, a future museum worker will receive a view of history as a whole and not as so many bits and pieces of scholarly enthusiasm? I do not mean by this an artificial integration through the fashionable inter-departmental course. That, to me, is often an academic gadget to compensate for individual deficiencies. I mean more that at the end of his undergraduate education the bits and pieces of what he has learned should be held in place in a larger framework. That his studies of the "action of a frog under blue light," for example, should bear an understandable relation to the larger problems of biology or physics. May we not hope that he will not be blinded to the fact that when he chooses a piece of furniture for his home or a tie to wear that his choice carries an aesthetic responsibility or that there is an inevitable bias of taste in the conduct of his courses? May we hope that he will never say, as I have heard said, "There is no such thing as good baroque." May we not expect as part of his undergraduate education a broad humanistic approach to history and an awareness of the continuity of historical forces as they operate today?

May we not require that his graduate education give him a familiarity with the tools of research, a certain competence in their use and a respect for scholarship which will enable him to begin specialized work in either a university or a museum? May we not suggest to him that it is essential to pick up a familiarity with the basic techniques involved in making a work of art even if we have to add it to the language requirements for the degree? Certainly in the highly technical area of conservation, it is obvious that we may expect the basic skills of his trade to be taught.

I do not see how it is possible for a university to do more. From here the museum must take over and training begins. It will differ because the museum as an institution is devoted to the thing—the practical object, whereas the university is concerned with the thing largely as a symbol. It is, I believe, a fundamental difference. We are not educational institutions with collections, but collections with educational responsibilities. A theory of a work of art recently expressed by Gotshalk in *Art and the Social Order* holds that a work of art consists of the relationship between the impulse of the

creator, the thing created and the reaction of the observer. This relationship is dealt with most directly perhaps in the museums where the adjustment between the observer and the thing is constantly and continuously being made. It is that adjustment which makes our ruggedly individualistic museum programs. It is that adjustment which must continually be kept in mind from the purchase of a work of art to the writing of a label. It is that adjustment that makes the difference between a curriculum-minded lecturer and a museum docent.

The present apprentice system with its offshoots of internes seems to work out fairly well in spite of its faults as a beginning step in training. But as museums, it can be argued that we have not done too well in advanced training. We have taken too little thought as to how to overcome the wage scale that puts a premium on administration with too little emphasis on scholarship or presentation. The resultant pressure on good scholars to attempt administration and good educational department material to become indifferent scholars is well known. Perhaps some professional standard which would allow an interchange of workers on various levels without prohibitive red tape or loss of prestige or money is needed. Individual efforts have been made in this direction but there is nothing like the freedom to move that exists in the university area.

We have no system of postgraduate training for men who start their work in smaller museums with a firm belief in what a museum can mean to a community, but who need further work in various fields to develop their inherent potential values or to prepare them to move on.

In spite of these gaps in professional training, it is, I am sure, an adjustment between the educated museum worker and the museum in which he works that will ultimately determine whether he will take up the intense concentration of the curator or the more varied tasks of presentation.

As for administration, I am afraid nothing can be done about the director.

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE INTELLIGENCE DEPARTMENT, MFA & A SECTION, OMGB, 1946-1949

By Edgar Breitenbach

EARLY in 1946, when the first great rush of shipments of art treasures to the Central Collecting Point was over, it became evident that a documents center was necessary to assist in the immense task of making an inventory and identifying the countless number of objects. Consequently an office was set up with a German curator and two assistants whose first task it was to put the great quantities of documents into working order. When in the summer of 1946 the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives field offices were reduced to two, one for the northern and one for the southern half of the country, the documents center was placed under the supervision of the MFA & A Officer for Southern Bavaria. Its task was defined as follows: to assist through documentary proof in the establishment of ownership of art objects in custody of the Central Collecting Point; to gather information from various Nazis who were involved in looting of works of art, as far as they were available for questioning in Bavaria; to work on the claims submitted by foreign government, or by individuals, through the MFA & A office at OMGUS, and to follow up any leads contained in such claims by interrogating and investigating in the whole of Bavaria; to keep a watch over the art market for any violations of Military Government laws especially with respect to stolen and restitutable art property. This program remained basically the same as long as the office existed.

Looking back, one must regret that in 1945 only one MFA & A officer from OMGUS was assigned to take care of art intelligence work, and that he had no counterpart in the Laender. During the first six months of the occupation, when it was an easy matter to hold people for questioning, a team working out of Munich could have recovered a great many art objects. It could have gone after the Fuehrerbau loot, the Ahnenerbe cache in the Franconian caves, the Generalbauamt repositories in the counties of eastern Bavaria, to cite only a few examples. Combing the region of Berchtesgaden for loot taken from the Goering train, and from the houses of the leading

Party members, or the country around Passau for the art treasures from Hungary would have been highly profitable at that time. As it was, none of these projects were taken up until much later, by which time much of the effectiveness of such a search was lost.

In the summer of 1945 many of the leading figures of the Nazi art world were interned together in the enclosures of Alt-Aussee. As a result of intensive questioning, the basic facts about Nazi art looting were established and laid down in the excellent OSS Consolidated Interrogation Reports, which became the standard reference document for all later art intelligence work. By studying these reports it became evident that much might be gained by a more detailed questioning of the leading Nazi art dealers. They could in the first place be useful in the identification at the Collecting Point of restitutable objects which had passed through their hands; secondly, they could reveal the names of others who were still holding on to such material; and finally they were in some cases found to be themselves still in the possession of art objects from the occupied countries.

At a test case Frau Almas-Dietrich was chosen. In 1933, when the Nazis came to power, Frau Almas was running a modest art business which kept going mainly through her rug repair workshop. Lacking the necessary capital, she specialized in pictures, which at that time were low in price and little in demand—Munich genre and landscape paintings from the turn of the century. She had a half-Jewish illegitimate daughter and through her marriage to a Turkish Jew (who later left her) had herself become a convert to the Hebrew faith. Yet, while all signs were pointing toward Dachau rather than the Fuehrerbau, Frau Almas grew to become Hitler's foremost art dealer. There were several reasons for this unparalleled rise: Hitler felt at home with her in matters of taste, education and knowledge of art; she was possessed of an enormous business drive, and because of her past could ill afford the slightest dishonesty. During the war Frau Almas acquired a great many art objects in the occupied countries of Western Europe, and became well acquainted with the activities of her colleagues in the same areas. This knowledge was utilized by us to the fullest extent through patient questioning which continued over a period of four years. As a result numerous and important art objects could be identified and restituted to the countries from whence they had come.

The experience thus gained became a standard procedure. All art dealers who were known to have operated in occupied countries and who were available in the Munich area were closely screened. Among them were Walter Andreas Hofer, Goering's art curator, who, while still held in detention, worked for months on the identification of works of art, mainly from the

Goering collection; Joseph Angerer, Goering's rug expert; Kajetan Muehlmann, who had played a notorious role first in Poland and afterwards in Holland; Karl Haberstock, from whom most of the outstanding pictures of the Hitler collection had come; Bornheim, who had taken over the firm of A. S. Drey and who had been much favored by Goering; Adolf Weinmueller, who had auctioned off many confiscated Jewish collections; marchand-amateurs such as Adolf Wuester; art dealers Maria Gillhausen, Gutbier, Scheidwimmer, and many others.

During the night preceding the occupation of Munich, after the SS guards protecting the Party building had fled, the people from the neighborhood, joined by DP's began to loot the Nazi buildings around the Koenigsplatz. When all the food and liquor and much of the furniture had been carted off, the crowd stormed the air raid cellar of the Fuehrerbau, where about 500 paintings were stored, disregarding the piles of Panzerfaust grenades over which they had to climb. By the end of the second day, when the looting was finally stopped, all the pictures were gone.

The loss was quite considerable. It included 259 items of the Schloss collection, perhaps the finest private collection of Dutch 17th century paintings, which the Nazis had looted from France, and about the same number of pictures which had been recently acquired for the Linz Museum, and which for lack of transportation had not been shipped for storage to the Alt-Aussee mine. As for the Schloss collection, which had been sent to Munich back in 1943, its continued presence there was caused by a personal whim of Hitler, who liked to study the paintings whenever he stayed in Munich.

In the late fall of 1945, and again in January, 1946, an appeal was made through the press to the local people to return the paintings which had been stolen. Unfortunately the appeal set forth a brief time limit after which severe punishment would be given to those who would still be found in possession of stolen pictures.

The appeal met with moderate success. Some paintings were turned in by people who had found them in their apartments where some DP's had abandoned them. Others returned just one or two, enough to establish themselves in the good graces of the authorities with the intention of holding back other paintings for themselves, as was revealed by later investigations. It is a pity that Army regulations at that time did not permit the use of rewards in the form of food and cigarettes. This would almost certainly have been instrumental in recovering considerable parts of the stolen collection.

The real search was not begun until the summer of 1946 when a Van der Helst portrait from the Schloss collection was captured near the Swiss border,

after it had passed through a dozen hands and its price had risen to more than RM 100.000. The detailed investigation of this first case set the pattern of all later ones of a similar nature. It provided us with basic knowledge of how such unorthodox art deals were transacted. It also acquainted us with some of the persons engaged in such transactions, whose names were entered in a roster. Though the circle of persons grew as time passed, most of our new clients had connections with some others whom we already knew. Some of them were art dealers, mostly the small and dubious ones; the rest came from all walks of life, from uprooted aristocrats to maidservants and workmen. The number of Munich residents who made a living through dealing in art was very considerable until June, 1948, when the currency was reformed. Of these, only a minority was actually in possession of works of art, by far the greater number of these people were middle-men, who were passing around lists of paintings supposedly offered for sale by someone who could often be contacted only through a chain of other middle-men.

Occasionally such lists gave us important clues. There was one case in 1947 where a list which had played a part in some street corner deal contained an item which seemed to match with one of the stolen Linz paintings. It was soon found in the possession of a doctor who swore that he had inherited it from his parents. Actually he had just acquired it from a piano maker, a rabid art collector, who in turn had received it from a dealer in musical instruments. This person confessed voluntarily, after some initial reluctance, that the piano maker had bought from him not one, but nine paintings which, he felt sure, were all looted. It took a couple of months before all paintings in this chain were recovered, including five others, which the thief, a resident of Schwabing, had sold to some other individual.

Not all chains were as long, nor was the outcome always so successful; there was no way of telling beforehand. It was not sufficient to recapture a painting, but in each instance the history of the case with all its ramifications had to be investigated. At times it took months before enough evidence was collected to break a case. To illustrate this: In October, 1948, the *Neue Zeitung* published an article about our activities, as a result of which someone gave us a seemingly insignificant piece of information which happened to be the missing link in a particular chain. In short order, this information enabled us to recover around 30 paintings, most of which were from a house within a few minutes' walking distance of the Fuehrerbau. That this could happen as late as the fall of 1948 indicates that many missing paintings are still hidden in the slums of Schwabing.

Except in rare cases, we made it a rule not to prosecute the people found

in the possession of stolen pictures. This policy was actually the basis of our success. An individual could count on our leniency, provided he voluntarily gave up his ill-gotten property and told us the whole truth. Only when a person was caught lying did we bring the case before a military court. We may recall the case of a German maid, employed by an American family, who swore that she had no more than the three paintings which we found in her room. Several months later, it was found, through entirely different channels, that she had three more paintings buried in a potato patch. Fortunately it was a hot dry summer and the paintings suffered little. In this case the culprit's punishment was light; she received a suspended sentence and did not even lose her job.

A word of high praise must go to the president of the Munich City Police, who, in spite of personnel shortage, set aside an able officer to accompany the American investigator on all his searches. In the course of time this officer became an expert in cases involving art treasures. It is hoped that his training will bear fruit in the future, since many important paintings are still missing.

In the summer of 1947 Goering's former art curator W. A. Hofer was called to the house of a young student in Koenigsee to inspect a painting which was recognized at once as a painting of the Roger van der Weyden school, formerly belonging to Goering. This incident touched off an intensive search in the Berchtesgaden region, which for lack of personnel had not been undertaken earlier.

Towards the end of the war Goering had moved his priceless art collection, and much of his personal property from the Berlin air raid shelter to his castle at Veldenstein in the Oberpfalz. When in April, 1945, the front came closer every day, his personal trains were ordered to proceed to Berchtesgaden where they stood for weeks, moving into a tunnel whenever the air raid alarm sounded. On May 3 W. A. Hofer was ordered to remove the most precious objects into the new air shelter of the so-called Stabsamt which first had to be cleared of its contents, clothing material, food, tobacco and liquor. All these scarce items were put into the box cars which had been left partly empty after the most important art objects had been taken away. After that, five cars were moved to a siding on Unterstein station, a stop-over on the road to Koenigsee.

Soon the rumor spread that the box cars contained ammunition, and everybody around the station was seized by the fear that his house might be destroyed, should the ammunition dump be blown up in the final struggle which was then approaching. Then somebody started to open one of the cars,

and discovered the treasures. He was quickly joined by others and what followed was a free for all. Witnesses relate that people suddenly appeared from everywhere "like ants." Under the influence of the liquor which was quickly consumed on the spot, fights ensued. Everybody tried to grab what was scarce and precious. Statues and paintings which were in the way were simply thrown out of the cars. The scene lasted for several hours until the village police finally put a stop to it.

Our search two years later was not an easy matter, since it had to be conducted among a highly clannish peasant population and among refugees who were often afraid of their local hosts. Nevertheless, with human understanding and a good deal of humor we managed to recover several paintings and pieces of sculpture, gobelins, rugs, and quantities of silver and glassware. Obviously, these items constitute only a fraction of what has been looted, much of which is said to have been taken across the Austrian border. Unfortunately there is no list in existence of what was loaded on to the Goering train. Thus, there is no way of telling what is actually still missing.

Security measures, however stringent, are never better than the men who are charged to enforce them. The Collecting Point had an elaborate guard system. There were guards inside the building and at the entrances, and posts in the courtyards and on the street. The system above all was designed to cope with riots and burglars, but relied to a large measure on the honesty of the people employed within the installation. For one thing, there were no house detectives to spy on the packers and the guards themselves.

In summer, 1947, one heard talk on the black art market that you could get almost anything out of the Collecting Point. Unfortunately there was some truth in the rumor; at that time a small art dealer returned to the Pinakothek a well-known Spitzweg, the loss of which had not even been noticed, and subsequently a check revealed that still another famous Spitzweg, the "Serenissimus" was missing. Investigations on the part of the criminal police were of no avail. Soon afterwards a Van Dyck portrait of the Iconography series, also belonging to the Pinakothek was recovered, and again our efforts to find the thief were thwarted. At a certain point the chain broke off.

In March 1948, we finally had a lucky break. Going through the Linz photos of Spitzweg paintings, the Director General of the Bavarian State Picture Galleries happened to hit upon a picture which three weeks before a reputable art dealer had shown to him for expertise. A check revealed that not only this painting was missing from the Collection Point, but so were more than half of the fifty Spitzwegs formerly in Hitler's and Heinrich Hoff-

mann's possession. This time the chain did not break off, for the tenth link which we established was a packer employed at the Collecting Point, who had been acting as a fence for the thief, who turned out to be one of our trusted guards. It took us many months before all angles had been investigated, and before we had exhausted all leads. More than twenty Spitzwegs were recovered, including some which had found their way into Switzerland. There were also three Van Dyck portraits and a good many paintings of the Munich school, Russian silverware, two precious jewels of the Rothschild collection, porcelain and books. Although three men were convicted and sentenced to jail terms, the case has never been entirely solved. On the one hand, there are a number of paintings—fortunately not too important works—which were never found; on the other hand, certain objects were recovered without our being able to trace them to any particular thief.

Since some of the still missing objects are private property, the Claims Office will be concerned with the matter for final settlement.



WILLIAM SCHOCK, *The Draughtsman* Brush drawing, 1950

CONTEMPORARY DOCUMENTS

I TEACH FUNDAMENTALS¹

By George Grosz

TO OPEN the "inner" eyes of my pupils, to get them to see the hidden "image" and discover the "invention" in Nature—the very Art beneath the outer appearance of Life, Forms and Things of Nature—that is the essential objective in my teaching. Students should discover the underlying abstraction, maybe the geometric planning of Nature and the place of "ornament," and that means discipline and concentration.

I believe in teaching fundamentals, working directly from the model, knowing anatomy and perspective. A sound knowledge of Nature seems to me the foundation for all creation. I mean Nature in a more total sense, from the human eye to the little falling leaf or the ripple of water in a pool. It is my belief that a painter and draftsman, even the most abstract, should always go back to Nature to refresh his creative mind and memory of form. I advise my students to master all techniques in order to express their individual concepts of form.

Since coming to America I have changed. I have become more realistic. My struggle is for a clearer, rounder form. At first in the United States my outlook was hazy. I could not see the entirely new surroundings sharply enough because my mind was not clear. I liked what I saw and experienced but I was still bewildered; so were my water colors.

I became easily influenced by the great sense of fact in America. Everything is very clear-cut and intelligible. That is what I now aim for. I prefer to avoid all haziness and unintelligibility and try to make my new pictures better understood. To make and build a new existence in a new land means not looking back too often, but looking forward; to be positive, not critical, not pessimistic—that is why I could not do caricature. My heart was no longer in it. A certain little splinter in my eye was not there. It was gone.

Of course, tradition is strong within me and so I look with admiration at my beloved "old masters," at the Dürer, Huber, and Altdorfer landscapes; at Hans Baldung Grien, Mathias Gruenewald, Joerg Ratgeb and Hans Sebald Beham, the so-called *Kleinmeister*.

¹ From a letter to the students of the Cleveland Institute of Art written for the opening of a one-man show of his recent oils and water colors held there in February, 1950.

My landscapes follow what we might call an animated realism. I go out and study closely; from the pebble or blade of grass near me I grope my way toward the horizon, to the middleground and into the background. I walk slowly, step by step. Hundreds of careful intimate studies are done before I do the actual painting. Sometimes it is plain "imitation" which excites me. If I say "imitation," I am using this old word in the sense of the ancient and holy St. Francis, humbly acknowledging the inexhaustible treasure of form and life in God's great creation.

For seven years I spent my summers on Cape Cod to restore my sense of Nature, to draw and paint the dunes and seascapes, as I had always wished to do from the time I left the little town near the Baltic Sea where I grew up. A deep feeling of foreboding has constantly been in me. Whether I have inherited it or whether its origin might be traced back to the talk and fairy tales of an old peasant maid we had when I was a young boy, who knows? I often had a premonition of impending disaster and death. My only trip back to Europe, and especially a visit to Paris in 1935, verified my impression of doom. Most of my friends laughed at me then because I could not explain exactly what was troubling me.

But after I had returned to the States, my paintings became prophetic. I was compelled by an inner warning to paint destruction and ruins; some of my paintings I called "Apocalyptic Landscapes" though that was quite some time before the real thing took place. Walking by the Sound near Douglaston, Long Island, where I lived, it often seemed to me that I saw a faraway shine of ghastly fires and a feeling of utter horror crept up in me. The great Swedenborg who thought and believed that Hell was right here in our midst came to my mind. My pictures began to reflect this. They became dark with illuminated ruins and lighted pyres of bloody rubble and crawling rats. One day—it must have been in a dream—I saw a tremendous crater, I heard my name, before me everything went up in a pile of smoke and debris. Later, much later, I was informed that the house where my mother had lived in Berlin had been completely bombed out. My mother had disappeared with her sister and the other inhabitants. Only a big hole and the rats were left.

However, this is not the only side of my painting. I do not specialize forever in horror and death. Rather I would like to say, like the poet Walt Whitman, that there are many sides to a man's nature. There are also within me regions without fear, death and war. I can see sensuous landscapes where nymphs and the great god Pan live. As a "survivor" I admire many old masters and their gifts of invoking an innocent, bucolic-arcadian world.

I think of Rubens and Renoir who were never troubled by visions of their beautiful nudes disfigured, raped or tormented. Yes, I too have a little of this fortunate gift within me. But, in general, I am too much a product of our troubled and complex times. My world is full of shadows and less sunny. I am too much aware of the great labyrinth we live in, what we have to go through to find the right way out, and that we are forever trying to escape the man-eating Minotaur.

REVOLUTION IN PRINTMAKING

By Adolf Dehn

JUST as the whole art world has experienced a revolution in recent times, the print-making world has also experienced one. Along with the changed concepts of what makes a picture there has come an eagerness for technical experiments. In the main this breaking of the tight old barriers has enriched the work of contemporary printmakers except among certain workers whose love of the unique line, the new and ingratiating texture (that is a love of the technique itself), became the end and not a means to the end.

A most unique development has been the silk screen or serigraph. Two advantages of the silk screen process are that it can be set up inexpensively in the studio, and that the prints are in full color. This is a desirable factor with many potential purchasers who demand color on their walls at a low price.

The etching and engraving world has been greatly revitalized with the new experiments of such artists as Hayter and Lasansky.

Having worked for many years on the lithograph stone and in no other field of printmaking I can, however, write only about lithography.

The art of lithography had reached low ebb in the early part of the twentieth century. Then Bolton Brown, having a passionate interest in lithography, did much to stimulate interest, more through his writing than his own lithographs, which were slight. His association with George Bellows was fortunate, for we think of Bellows as starting the interest in contemporary lithography. He broke with the Victorian past. His drawing was free and he presented a document of his time. Many of the workers in lithography today began working shortly after Bellows' untimely death.

When I started drawing on the stone, there was one traditional way of making a lithograph. It was the approach of the purist. Neatness and the

smooth surface were the highest virtues. The student was cautioned, "Don't do this, don't do that." The only thing one was allowed to do was to sharpen the crayon, preferably a hard one, to the finest possible point and then stroke the stone for days on end until a clean little design had been developed. It is of course evident that beautiful and great prints can be made in this manner. Castelon, Wengen Roth and Lozowick are among the best workers in this direction.

This delicate and careful way of drawing was stifling for some of us. It killed the creative impulse, deadened the hand. In my own case a desire for experimentation arose. I wanted to try anything and everything to see if it would print. We called it raping the stone. Luckily most of these experiments printed remarkably well. The crayons were applied with violence, then rubbed with a flannel or rough cloth and wonderful unexpected tones arrived. Washes were made not only with brushes but with wet rags. Razor blades, etching needles, ink erasers, sandpaper and a gelatine sheet were used to scrape light greys and whites out of previously created black and grey washes. The medium of lithography became free and flexible. It was in accord with what we had to say as artists.

Although I have made several hundred lithographs, I do not print my own stones. The same is true of many, in fact, most of our leading lithographic printmakers. This is important. The artist, whatever his chosen field may be, can turn to lithography and make an occasional print, for a sufficient knowledge of drawing on the stone can be acquired quickly, and a good printer can make better prints than the amateur artist-printer. Far too often the artist who gets involved in printing spends so much of his energy in experimenting with printing processes that his creative force is spent and his lithograph as a work of art is unimportant.

There are few good lithographic printers. It would be a happy condition if more art schools could train fine printers. How this should be done is a problem, for among the artist-printers there are few whose skill and knowledge is great enough, and too many of the professional printers are jealous of the secrets of their craft. Advice from artist-printers like Lawrence Barrett of the Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center, Will Barnet of New York and Max Kahn of Chicago would be of great help.

When one thinks of the growing interest in art in America among a large class of people whose pocket-books and walls are small, prints should be in great demand. This is unfortunately not true. I do not know of a leading printmaker in this country who can make a good living out of prints. We

all must earn the greater part of our incomes through teaching, the sale of paintings, commercial art or baby sitting.

Despite this lack of a large buying public the artists' love of printmaking is great and it is growing. A means of greater distribution would stimulate us even more. If this can be done, and how it is to be done, I sadly admit I do not know.

ON TECHNICAL PROCESSES IN PRINTMAKING

By Mauricio Lasansky

IN THE recent past, printmakers have been slaves of "clock" techniques. For a birch tree, one could leave a plate in the acid for only 32 seconds, for an oak, 46 seconds. This concept led to nothing but formulas called "technique." Once I planned to etch an oak tree for 46 seconds, but something went wrong with the electricity and the clock stopped. I took a print and discovered that it was no longer an oak tree, but nevertheless it was a beautiful thing. Since then, for me, printmaking is more than a matter of three drops of this added to four drops of that. Some of my students get seven drops, some only one.

Technical training is based on the theory that nothing is impossible in printmaking. The student finds that even if three-quarters of his plate is unsatisfactory, he may still correct and improve it by scraping down the metal. This, of course, will develop security and a fearless experimental attitude in the individual, and allow him a freedom from sterile "technical" standards. With the emphasis removed from technique, the student may then realize that techniques and aesthetics are one and the same in a work of art.

An experimental attitude is necessary to discover new possibilities and new means of adapting techniques to each new plate; for example, the combination in one single print of woodcut, copper plate and litho stone. The fusion of these media can be accomplished while continuing to respect their individual character.

Drawing can serve as the first inspiration for a print, but once it is transcribed to the copper, it is forgotten, and the plate begins to dictate the ultimate results. I try to build each student's psychological makeup and enable him to develop his own form of expression. When a problem occurs, he is only shown a technical solution and made to feel that there is always more than one solution.

Technique, with all her resources, is so complex that you cannot explain her by mere terminology. My concept of technique is freedom, freedom to experiment in any way and to draw inspiration from any source whatsoever. Freedom is technique and technique is freedom: they are the same.

CRAFTSMANSHIP, PRINTMAKING, AND CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION

By Harry Sternberg

I DO not believe that there is any further need for discussion on the usefulness of creative art in education. Since the graphic arts have played such a minor role, however, I think it urgent to emphasize the relationship of printmaking to education.

Some years ago I participated in the organization of a "Committee on Art Education" sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. Its general aim was the advancement of creative art education, the establishment of a forum for the expression of new ideas, and a laboratory for the study and promotion of new techniques.

Because of their long experience with art in education, I felt that they would have a valid contribution to make, particularly in the use of graphic art in education. "The Graphic Arts," said Charles Cooke, speaking for the Committee, "have a particular place in any curriculum which seeks to meet the many needs of the general student. With the increasing knowledge of human growth and development being thoughtfully applied to the educative process, with the emerging understanding of the educational implications of the creative process, and with a deepening concept of the individual's role in a democratic society, the many educational values of Graphic Arts become more clear. The Graphic Arts call forth a combination of manipulative, explorative, technical and highly creative responses in unique ways which can meet individual student needs (at various age levels) and afford wholly new and fascinating adventures, thus giving basic satisfactions so essential in a vigorous educational program."

The term "craftsman" carries with it the interest and respect of all people. It implies absolute understanding and mastery of the tools and the materials that are being worked. It suggests a deep love of the process of making. It infers the setting of severe critical standards by the craftsman for himself. These are ideal qualities that give meaning to living and doing—

and it is these qualities that the graphic arts demand from the graphic artist.

Mass production, mechanical devices and specialization have almost eliminated these qualities from our society. Most men no longer make whole things, but are limited to the activity of making only some one minute part of the whole. This holds true even in the professional fields. Many doctors do not deal with man, but only with some limited area of his anatomy. There are dentists who only extract. There are few educators, but many teachers in narrow and specialized fields.

This is inevitable in a society as complex as ours, but a man's need for his personal making of whole things is evidenced by the surge of interest in the crafts—in the growth of hobby activity—in the interest in the "how to do it" literature. These perform the function of giving some psychotherapy. The graphic arts answer much of this need and, in this sense, aside from others, can play an important part in education.

Printmaking demands of the artist all the qualities of creativity and craftsmanship. The whole creation, from its conception to its completion, is his alone. He must learn to love, master and control his tools and materials. He is even offered the fulfillment of personal dignity in the signing of his finished creation. All these give meaning to living and doing. A sheet of paper can be carelessly scribbled on and tossed aside. Areas of a canvas can be scraped clean or over-painted. But the unblemished perfection of a shining, polished metal plate, the clear-grained smoothness of a block of wood awakens deep respect in the artist. A grained stone, the stretched silk and the etching plate pressure the artist to deeper contemplation and longer thought before he makes his first mark. Change and correction require tedious periods of demanding effort.

The potential for multiple reproduction also makes higher demands on the graphic artist, and the aesthetically sensual qualities of these media stimulate exploration and reward within new areas of experience. Much of the cutting, the acid biting, the gluing and stopping-out in the graphic processes are done in reverse and bear little relationship to the end result. The picture remains hidden in the incised line or lies concealed beneath the bubbles of the acid bath. The moment of pulling the finished print is filled with tense expectation. There is fear that the new child may be deformed or sickly; there is high hope that it will be perfect. But in either case, there is always the joy of seeing one's own child being born. It is through imparting these qualities that the graphic arts can make important contributions to education.

obituaries

ARTHUR PILLANS LAURIE

By EDWARD W. FORBES

The world has lost a great benefactor—one who worked with ability and success in quiet fields of learning and art appreciation "Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife."

Professor Arthur Pillans Laurie was well known in Europe and America in the art world for his long and patient researches and great knowledge of the construction and chemistry of paintings and how they were executed during the centuries when most of the great paintings of the world were created.

Dr. Laurie was born in Scotland in 1861, the eldest son of Professor S. S. Laurie, and received his education at the Edinburgh Academy and Edinburgh University. Later he was elected a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and was Cantor Lecturer in 1891.

He held various positions of trust and responsibility, and in 1900 was appointed Principal of Heriot Watt College in Edinburgh which post he held until 1929. During his incumbency he increased the scope and importance of that college. At the same time he continued his researches and from 1912 to 1936 he was also Professor of Chemistry in the Royal Academy of Art.

He was one of the pioneers in the field of applying science to the study of the physical condition of works of art. His studies and teaching included the research into the methods and material of the old masters by chemical study as well as the use of the X-ray, ultra violet and infra red rays, microscopic examination, micro photographs, and the perusal of the early documents which bore on these studies.

His influence was spread far and wide

by his books, his numerous articles in art and scientific journals, his letters to the newspapers, and the laboratory training which he gave to his students. He had great influence in arousing public opinion in Europe and America.

I am glad to take this opportunity to express my debt of gratitude to him. His books were full of information which was of great value to me in my studies in these fields. I sought him out in Edinburgh in 1922 and later—after he had moved to London—I went to him at various times to discuss technical problems.

His earlier books are not so well known perhaps: "Scientific Investigations in Physics and Chemistry" and "The Food of Plants" in 1893; and "Greek and Roman Methods of Painting" in 1910.

Then came "Material Used in the Painters' Craft from the Earliest Times to the End of the 17th Century" in 1911 which contains a valuable bibliography of the books on this subject.

"The Pigments and Mediums of the Old Masters" in 1914 was concerned largely with illuminated manuscripts. He pointed out that from them it was much easier to get authentic knowledge of the pigments used by the old masters, for most of the important books have been preserved in libraries for centuries and have not been exposed to the dangerous touch of incompetent restorers, the mischief which can be caused by varnishes, and the fading of pigments exposed to the light. In this book he gives a valuable chronology of pigments, the first ever published.

In 1926 he published "Painters' Methods and Materials" which was useful as a sort of handbook for modern artists. In 1929 came "A Study of Rembrandt

and His School" and in 1932 "The Brushwork of Rembrandt and His School" in which he showed the value of micro photographic study of the brushwork of the great masters. Rembrandt had a peculiar brushstroke of his own. In painting an eye, for instance, it is possible for copyists and inferior painters to paint the white of the eye accurately as far as drawing, colour, and value go; but when seen in a micro photograph, the quality of the brushstroke is sure to be different.

"Simple Rules for Painting in Oils" and "Pictures and Politics" were published in 1934; "New Light on Old Masters" in 1935; and finally, during his last years, at the age of 87, he published an interesting and attractive book in which he sums up in fairly concise form a great deal of the fruits of his long and great experience. This book is entitled "The Technique of the Old Masters" and was published just before his death at Haslemere Hospital in Surrey County, England, on October 7, 1949.

Professor Laurie's reputation was so great that he was called as a witness in various famous lawsuits concerning the authenticity of pictures where his special knowledge and experience made his testimony important. For instance, there was the well known Hahn-Duveen lawsuit. Mr. Hahn brought a picture of La Belle Ferronniere to America which he claimed was the original, and he called the famous Louvre Leonardo a copy. Dr. Laurie was called to the Louvre and had the opportunity of comparing the two pictures. In the chapter on Forgeries, in his recent book, Dr. Laurie tells of some of his various experiences in dealing with this type of problem.

Professor Laurie, in his earlier books, examined the problem of the use of emulsions by Van Eyck. In the January, 1934, number of "Technical Studies in the Field of the Fine Arts," he brought forth his later belief that the Van Eyck medium was stand oil. In his latest book,

he again urges the importance of this idea.

Among those in this country who have profited directly by his teachings are Professor Arthur Pope of Harvard, Professor Daniel V. Thompson, formerly of Yale and the Courtauld Institute, and many others. For several years he served on the Advisory Committee of "Technical Studies."

In the notice of his death published in the London *Times* of October 15, 1949, appears the following statement: "... his wide interests and breadth of view found expression in an astonishingly varied series of activities. He was a close friend of the late Earl Lloyd-George and the latter constantly turned to him for advice on scientific subjects during the 1914-18 war, and at various times he served on committees dealing with such subjects as the supply of chemicals, chemical waste products, and building materials. He was chairman of the chemical inventions committee of the Ministry of Munitions and for a time served as a member of the Building Research Board of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research."

He received the degrees of Doctor of Science and Doctor of Laws from Edinburgh University. He was a Fellow of the Chemical Society, an Honorary Royal Scottish Academician, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh.

A cordial, generous nature was one of his marked characteristics. It is thus spoken of in the article in the *Times*: "Generations of students at the Academy Schools will remember his jovial presence at the lecture table, whether conducting experiments dressed in a farmer's smock or expatiating in his inimitable way on the materials of the painters' craft."

So we feel that this gifted pioneer in his chosen field of science and art combined has started a movement which has increased in importance and we are sure will continue to do so.

WOLFGANG BORN

By RALPH L. WICKISER

Dr. Wolfgang Born, author of "Still Life Painting in America" and "Landscape Painting in America," died in New York City, June 15, 1949. Dr. Born was born in Breslau, Germany, October 2, 1893. He studied history of art with Heinrich Wölfflin at the University of Munich and received his doctorate at the University of Vienna. He also studied painting in art schools in Germany and with Vuillard in Paris.

After teaching in Vienna he came to Maryville College in St. Louis in 1937. He subsequently taught courses in the history of art at The Iranian Institute in New York, Queens College, Louisiana State University, Hunter College and The City College of New York, where he was teaching at the time of his death.

As a painter, Dr. Born exhibited paintings, drawings, woodcuts and lithographs in one-man shows in Vienna, Munich, Berlin and St. Louis. He illustrated Thomas Mann's "Death in Venice" and other books. Dr. Born lectured in Vienna, Berlin, London, New York, St. Louis, New Orleans and at The National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Born's reputation, however, was based largely on his voluminous writings for magazines in Europe and the United States. He published articles in *Die Kunst*, *Art and Industry*, *Apollo*, *The Connoisseur*, *Ciba Symposia*, *Antiques*, *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, *The American Collector*, *Burlington Magazine* and others. He wrote on the history of art in Europe, comparative studies of the art in the East and in the West and psychological and cultural topics.

His books included *Still Life Painting in America*, published by Oxford University Press in 1947 and *American Landscape Painting*, published by The Yale University Press in 1948. The latter book was selected as among the hundred best books of the year in 1949 by The New York Times.

Dr. Born was at the height of his

creative capacity and left several unfinished manuscripts and articles. His vivid interest in American art has made America aware of its painting heritage and has stimulated research in American art.

MEHMET AGA-OGU

By MAURICE S. DIMAND

The untimely death of Dr. Mehmet Aga-Oglu was a great shock to all his friends and colleagues both here and abroad. Born of Turkish parents in 1896 at Erivan in the South Caucasus, he attended the Moscow University from 1912 to 1916, and the Lazarowski Institute of Oriental Studies, specializing in languages and history of Islamic countries. From 1922 to 1924 he studied archaeology and history of art at the Universities of Berlin and Jena. From 1924 to 1926 he was a member of the Fine Arts Institute of Professor Josef Strzygowski at the University of Vienna, where he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

His academic career began in 1926 as Curator of the Islamic Department of the National Museum at Istanbul and as an Assistant Professor of Islamic art at the University of Istanbul. In 1928 he became Acting Director of the famous Evkaf Museum of Istanbul and continued teaching at the University.

In 1929 the directors and trustees of the Detroit Institute of Arts invited Dr. Aga-Oglu to become Curator of its Near Eastern Department. In this position he made a number of notable acquisitions in the field of Islamic art, which were published in the Museum's Bulletin and in other scientific magazines. In 1930 he arranged at the Detroit Institute his first loan exhibition of Muhammadan Decorative Arts. The greatest and no doubt most important period of his life began in 1933 when the University of Michigan invited him to organize a department of Islamic art and to become its first professor of Islamic Art and Archaeology. The Research Seminary in Islamic

Art soon developed into a center of Islamic studies in this country. He was the founder and the editor of "Ars Islamica", which became the most important periodical in the field of Islamic art and archaeology. The many important articles published in "Ars Islamica" by American and foreign scholars from 1933 to 1938 established its international reputation. In 1935 and 1938 he was visiting professor at the Summer Seminar of Arabic and Islamic Studies at Princeton University. In 1936 he was appointed Honorary Curator of Near Eastern Art at the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum in San Francisco, where he organized an excellent exhibition of Islamic art. At the University of Michigan he continued his research in the field of Islamic art, published a number of articles and books, among them "Persian Bookbindings of the Fifteenth Century" (1935), including many unknown specimens from the Istanbul museums.

From 1938 to 1948 Dr. Aga-Oglu devoted his time chiefly to research and publications of material which he gathered on his numerous trips to Europe and the Near East. His articles and books advanced greatly our knowledge of many periods and phases of Islamic art. In

1941 he published a volume on Safavid rugs and textiles in the Shrine of Imam 'Ali at al-Najaf. This important material was entirely unknown to Western scholars because the Shrine was inaccessible to non-Muhammadans.

In 1940 Dr. Aga-Oglu conceived an ambitious plan to publish in several volumes a "Corpus of Islamic Metalwork". He gathered all available source material on metalwork to be published in the first volume of his work. From conversation with Dr. Aga-Oglu it became evident to me that this work would be of the greatest value to all students of Islamic art. Part of his Corpus is ready and we hope that it can be made available to us very soon.

In 1948 the Textile Museum of Washington, D.C. appointed Dr. Aga-Oglu Consultant of Oriental rugs and textiles. He began his activities with his usual enthusiasm and from the start had many ideas about exhibitions of special types or groups of rugs. He conceived the plan of an exhibition of Caucasian dragon carpets, which opened October 18, 1948. He began his work on a catalog of Oriental rugs in the Textile Museum, which was unfortunately interrupted by his illness and premature death.

news reports

By Helen Foss, News Editor

ART NEWS IN SPAIN—ASSEMBLED BY CAMILA BAS AND TRANSLATED BY WALTER M. WALTER

Of interest to Americans will be the recent visit to Spain of Salvador Dali. His return to his Mediterranean seaport home on the romantic Costa Brava created considerable furor in Spanish artistic circles.

One of the most exciting notes of the recent art season was the showing of a "Crucifixion" by hitherto unknown present-day painter, Benito Prieto Coussent. Various persons have endeavored to acquire it and it was finally bought by the Galerías Layetanas of Barcelona which exhibited it in connection with its exposition of religious art. One of the art critics writing about it says, "The torso is worthy of Velasquez and the draperies reminds one of Zubaran. It is the Son of God made man with His body barbarously abused, distorted and bloody, but with a great and divine dignity. It is a most important work of art and one will hear much about it. It follows the ferociously realistic vein of Spanish paintings which reached its height under Valdes Leal."

An Ibero-Roman necropolis has been discovered in the town of Vilafant near Gerona. According to the Curator of the Archeological Museum of Gerona, it is an Iberian burying ground from the third or fourth century B.C.

In order to prevent their being altered and to protect them from further decay, the Ministry of Education has placed all

castles in Spain under the protection of the State. The municipalities in which they are found will be held responsible for the carrying out of this disposition. Special architects have been named whose duties it will be to assist in the preservation of these monuments. The National Office of Fine Arts is preparing a detailed illustrated inventory of all the castles in Spain.

In Sitges, near Barcelona, a new museum has been inaugurated. It is called the Nineteenth Century Home. It was donated by Don Manuel Llopis, former Spanish diplomat. The early 19th century character of this house has been conserved and its murals restored.

The ancient Cathedral of Lerida, built in 1274, which since the time of Philip the Fifth had been used for barracks, is being restored to its old glory.

A new art center, The Municipal Museum of Painting, has been inaugurated in Santander. It has a collection of approximately 200 paintings, among them some attributed to Goya, Zurbaran, Murillo, and Valdes Leal. The museum also has an interesting collection of Flemish paintings on copper.

The City of Caceras has been declared a national monument; also, the remains of the Gothic Convent Santa Margarita in Palma de Mallorca, and the Scala Palace in Valencia.

Recently an exposition was held in the City of Taragona of the Romanesque paintings from the Church of Peralta. News has been received that an entombment of Christ by El Greco has been discovered in Geneva; it has been authenticated by Augustus I. Mayer as having been painted approximately in 1576.

The modern wall is being removed from the Church of San Jeronimo, Madrid, in order to show its 15th century wall.

FREE BOOKLET ON TEXTBOOK PUBLICATION

For teachers who are writing textbooks, the Exposition Press, 253 Fourth

Ave., New York 10, N.Y., has issued a free, 32-page, illustrated booklet which discusses the problems of publishing from both the writer's and publisher's points of view. Special attention is given in the booklet to books with restricted audience appeal or limited sales potential but for which there is definite need. Copies may be had upon request.

RENOIR EXHIBITION

A comprehensive benefit Exhibition of Renoir will be held at the Wildenstein Gallery, 19 East 64th St., New York City, from March 22 to April 29, 1950. This exhibition will include important loans from France as well as from American public and private collections.

ART NEWS FROM COURRIER DE FRANCE

A Studio of Abstract Art opened in Paris on Oct. 17. Organized by André Garcin and directed by the painter Kosnick-Kloss, this school is continuing the tradition of the atelier directed by the late Otto Freundlich. The new school will offer instruction in painting, sculpture, engraving and the applied arts of mosaics, weaving and tapestry.

Henri Manguin, one of the first representatives of Fauvism, died recently at Saint-Tropez at the age of seventy-five.

The first volume of Jean Alazard's comprehensive history of Italian art, *L'Art italien des origines a la fin du XIVe siècle* (Editions Laurens, Paris) has just been published. The author is the director of the Algiers Museum of Fine Arts.

A sculptured head of Saint Louis has been discovered on the principal keystone of the chapel of the Château of Saint-Germain-en-Laye. According to the curator of the Château, this head is the oldest known portrait of a French king and it was executed when the 13th century monarch was twenty-two years old.

A non-profit "Centre de Recherches et de Documentation Artistiques" has been founded in Paris, 101 rue de Prony, to

do expert research for movie and theatrical producers, museum curators and art dealers in France and abroad. Annual membership dues range from 60 cents for associate members to \$14 for benefactor members. Questions may be submitted in French, English, Italian, Spanish and German. Answers will be given in French or English.

Films about art: *Guernica*, a film about Picasso's painting, is being completed by Alain Resnais, producers of *Van Gogh*. It will show Picasso's development from his blue and pink periods to his later and more abstract works. The following films have won success in the 1949 film festivals: *Césarée*, by J. C. Huisman, about North Africa's Roman cities; *L'Evangile de Pierre*, by André Bureau; *Les Gisants*, by Jean-François Noël, based on the tombs of French kings at Saint-Denis; and the color film *Images Médiévales*, a panorama of life in the Middle Ages made from famous illustrations.

The Oriental ceramics, illuminations and tapestries from the collections of the Musée des Arts Décoratifs were placed on exhibit on Nov. 14 for the first time since the war.

The Musée des Monuments Français has reopened in the Palais de Chaillot. Improved lighting in this museum facilitates study of reproductions of France's most important medieval frescoes, sculptures and stained glass windows.

The Historical Monuments Service has cleaned the frescoes in the choir vault of Notre-Dame-la-Grande at Poitiers.

Research carried on in the ruined Romanesque abbey of Saint-Gilles has revealed fragments of an exceptionally fine 12th century tympanum fresco representing the Ascension.

Twelve new galleries devoted to French painting from the 18th century to modern times have opened in Dijon's Fine Arts Museum.

The thesis of Alain's penetrating *Ingres* (Editions du Dimanche) is that this painter, traditionally identified with academism, was an innovator.

Yvon Delbos, Minister of Education, has signed a decree stipulating that one per cent of the funds appropriated for new school construction be used for murals and sculptures in the schools.

"The sculptors of France knew when they chose their career that it was uncertain and yielded small profit even to the greatest artists. They do not seek to enrich themselves, but simply to live and to fulfill their social function: to create monuments that will survive the cataclysms of time and embody for posterity the spirit of the present age. The government must recognize the importance of sculptors and their precarious economic position." So runs the manifesto recently issued by Saupicque, Leleu, Poisson, Cadenat, Prat, Debarre, Lacroix and some fifty other sculptors who have united to defend their interests in a new organization, the *Syndicat National des Sculpteurs*.

Paris' ethnographic museum, the *Musée de l'homme*, is exhibiting terra cotta statuettes and vessels made by the Sao peoples in the Chad between the 9th and 14th centuries. These were part of a find recently made at Tago, near Fort-Lamy, by Jean Lebeuf and his wife, Annie Masson-Detourbet.

The Minotaure Art School has reopened in Lyon under the direction of René Burlet.

The hundredth anniversary of the invention of reinforced concrete by the Frenchman Hennebique was marked by an architectural exhibit at the *Musée des Travaux Publics* showing the use of this material.

The engraver Jean-Eugène Bersier has published an illustrated text-book and history of his art: *La gravure, les procédés, l'histoire* (Paris, Editions de la Table Ronde).

An international conference of art experts will be held in Paris this year, according to a recent statement by Emile Martin, President of the *Chambre Syndicale de Experts Professionnels en Objets d'Art et de Collection*.

INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF ART MOVES

The new address of the International School of Art is 23 Washington Square North, New York 11, N.Y. Elma Pratt is the director.

CONE MEMORIAL EXHIBITION

Opening ceremonies of the Cone Memorial Exhibitions were held Friday, Jan. 13th, at the Baltimore Museum of Art. Principal speakers of the evening were David E. Finley, Director of the National Gallery of Art; William M. Milliken, Director of the Cleveland Museum of Art; Dr. George Boas, Head of the Department of Philosophy at the Johns Hopkins University, and Clive Bell, British writer and art critic. Mr. Bell was brought by the Municipal Art Society of Baltimore for the purpose of writing a critique on the Matisse works in the Cone Collection. The exhibition closed March 5th.

GALLERY HACKER TO OPEN

A new gallery, to be known as Gallery Hacker, devoting itself to main currents in modern painting, will open March 1st at 24 West 58th Street.

The gallery, owned by Seymour Hacker, art and rare book importer, will share the premises with Mr. Hacker's new retail art bookshop, Hacker Art-books.

Robert U. Godsoe will manage the bookshop and gallery. Mr. Godsoe, recently art critic for *Esquire*, was a former director of the Uptown Gallery and assembled the first Alfred Maurer Memorial Exhibition. He was later director of Gallery Secession where first or early showings of many now-prominent artists were given, including Milton Avery, Adolph Gottlieb, Mark Rothko, Louis Schanker, I. Rice Pereira, Pietro Lazzari and others. A number of these artists will be represented in exhibitions at the new Gallery Hacker.

Mr. Hacker, Director of Gallery

Hacker and Hacker Artbooks, opened Artbook Imports at its present address on Bleecker Street in August 1946. Though primarily a wholesale firm, Artbook Imports has issued catalogues of its specialties, out-of-print imported art books, bibliography and rare books, for several years. Upon removal to its new quarters a department devoted to domestic publications in the art field will be added. It is planned that the stock of art books will be one of the largest and most comprehensive in the field.

PITTSBURGH SHOWS FRICK PAINTINGS

Miss Helen C. Frick has lent fourteen paintings to the Department of Fine Arts, University of Pittsburgh, to commemorate the centenary of the birthday of her father, Henry Clay Frick. The exhibition ran from Dec. 19, 1949 to Feb. 15, 1950.

EMILY LOWE AWARD

The first annual exhibition of the Emily Lowe Award was held at the Ward Eggleston Galleries in January.

The jury, composed of Helen Carlson, Art Critic of the *New York Sun*; George Picken, artist and Instructor of Art at Columbia University and Cooper Union; and Charles Z. Offin, Editor-in-Chief of the art magazine *Pictures on Exhibit*, made the following awards: 1st award \$700, Vera Shapiro; 2nd award \$400, Lorraine Silbiger; 3rd award \$250, Bob Slutzky; 4th award \$150, Jules Kirschbaum.

The purpose of the Emily Lowe Award is to aid young American artists, between the ages of twenty and thirty, to bring their achievements before the public and further encourage them in the development of their art.

KANSAS EXHIBITION

The Friends of Art of Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas, displayed an exhibition of the work of artists living in or natives of Kansas and artists of the surrounding region from Feb. 19 to

March 6, in the Galleries of the Department of Architecture.

About half of this exhibition was by invitation. The remainder was selected by a jury consisting of Paul Gardner, Director of the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery, Kansas City, Mo.; Eugene Kingman, Director of the Joselyn Art Museum, Omaha, Nebr.; and ex officio, John F. Helm, Jr., Director of the Friends of Art, Kansas State College. From the jury recommendations, purchases totaling at least \$2000 were made.

SUMMER SCHOOLS AT BRITISH UNIVERSITIES

The Institute of International Education, 2 West 45th St., New York 19, N.Y., has published a brochure on the 1950 summer school at British Universities.

"The Arts in Britain To-day" will be presented at the University of London from July 10th to August 18th, and will be limited to 150 students.

All applications must be received by the Institute of International Education by March 15th and candidates will be informed of the result of their application by April 4th.

If interested, write to the Institute for the brochure, which also lists summer schools in other fields.

GIFT TO TEL AVIV MUSEUM

The National Serigraph Society's gift of twenty-eight serigraphs will be presented at the close of its current New York exhibition to the Tel Aviv Museum. The gift will be sent to Israel by the American Fund for Palestinian Institutions, New York.

XXV BIENNIAL IN VENICE

The 1950 Biennial Exhibition, to be held in the Venice gardens next summer, will include retrospective one-man shows of the sculpture of Medardo Rosso and Ernesto De Fiori, and a centenary exhibition of Giacomo Favretto's birth.

Other retrospective one-man shows

will include Lorenzo Viani of Viareggio (1882-1936); Mario Broglio of Piacenza (1891-1948), painter, founder and editor of the magazine *Valori Plastici*; Cino Bozzetti (1876-1949), engraver; and Gino Carlo Sensani (1888-1947), scenic and costume designer.

Also, the Biennial will organize an important retrospective exhibition of Henri Rousseau's works with a view to continuing the program of presenting the most artistic personalities following French Impressionism. None of his works have ever been exhibited at a Venice Biennial.

PASADENA EXHIBITS PERSIAN ART

Pasadena Art Institute, Pasadena, Calif., exhibited the "Arts of Persia," from the ninth to the nineteenth centuries including Mohammedan India, from Sept. 28 through Nov. 21, 1949. An illustrated catalogue of the exhibition was published.

STUDENTS PREPARE EXHIBIT

"How to Appreciate a Work of Art," an exhibition prepared by the Seminar in Art History of the University of Montreal, was shown at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts during October.

MUSEUM CATALOGUE PUBLISHED

The California Palace of the Legion of Honor has published an illustrated catalogue of the Museum's 25th anniversary exhibition of "Masterpieces of 18th Century French Art from the Museums of France." The price is \$1.75, which includes handling and mailing charges. Orders, accompanied by check or money order, should be addressed to Mrs. Edna Roche, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, Lincoln Park, San Francisco 21, Calif.

CINCINNATI EXCAVATIONS OF TROY TO BE PUBLISHED

The Princeton University Press is publishing a series of archeological vol-

umes reporting the finds made in the excavation of Troy, conducted by the University of Cincinnati between 1932 and 1938 under the direction of Carl Blegen.

The series of volumes reporting the results has been edited by Professor Blegen with the collaboration of J. L. Caskey and Marion Rawson. It is being issued in four illustrated quarto volumes, each of two parts, and a series of supplementary monographs dealing with human remains, coins, minor sites, and other special topics.

ADDITIONS TO THE YALE STAFF

Four Visiting Critics in Residence in the departments of architecture and painting of the Yale University Division of the Arts are: Alfred L. Aydelott, Memphis, Tenn.; Harris Armstrong, St. Louis, Mo.; Harwell H. Harris, Los Angeles, Calif., all in the department of architecture; and Josef Albers in the department of painting.

Appointed to the Yale faculty are: King Liu Wu as Assistant Professor of Architecture; Robert R. K. Russell, Jr., Instructor in Architecture; and Theodore Hood, Assistant in Instruction in Architecture.

NEWS FROM SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

"Art Day," November 28, was part of the third Annual Festival of Contemporary Arts, sponsored by the Institute of the Arts at the University of Southern California. Activities included demonstrations in ceramics methods by Glen Lukens and his students, demonstration of printmaking techniques by the S. C. Printmakers, showing of two abstract films, and a Pre-Christmas student-faculty art auction. Sculpture, ceramics, prints, drawings and paintings, and Christmas cards were auctioned by Donald Goodall, head of the Department of Fine Arts.

Gyorgy Kepes lectured on "Visual Form—Structural Form," December 14.

First prize of \$200 and a gold medal

were won by Prof. Francis de Erdely of the art faculty in the 17th annual exhibition at the Oakland Art Gallery. He was selected as the gallery's guest of honor for 1950 and a one-man show of his work has been scheduled for April.

Prof. Edgar Ewing's painting "View of Mt. Wilson" is among 15 from the state of California to be on display at the Carnegie Institute showing on the theme of "Painting in the United States, 1949."

Merrell Gage, Assoc. Prof. of Fine Arts, has just completed an architectural sculpture for the new gymnasium of Claremont High School, Claremont, Calif. Recently Mr. Gage was commissioned to do a portrait of Dean Emeritus Roy Abeaton of Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kan.

Ceramics classes of Assoc. Prof. Glen Lukens have spent $4\frac{1}{2}$ months working on western clays, and have developed good clays for stoneware and dinnerware together with glazes to fit these clays. During the summer, Prof. Lukens' students tested clays from Alabama and thus helped establish a ceramics course at Talladega College in Talladega, Ala.

ARCHAEOLOGISTS HOLD MEETING IN BALTIMORE

The Archaeological Institute of America, in conjunction with the American Philological Association, held its 51st general meeting in Baltimore on Dec. 28-30, 1949.

The program included: First Session for the Reading of Papers, C. Bradford Welles of Yale University presiding, "Fractional Quantities in Minoan Book-keeping," Emmett L. Bennett, Jr., Yale University; "Recent Excavations in Samothrace," Karl Lehmann, New York University; "The Frog Lamps of Roman Egypt," Louise A. Shier, University of Michigan; "Mycenaean Stelae," George E. Mylonas, Washington University.

Second Session for the Reading of Papers, Mary H. Swindler of the University of Pennsylvania presiding, "Saite Sculpture," William Stevenson Smith,

Boston Museum of Fine Arts; "Neolithic Figurines and Aegean Inter-relations," Saul S. Weinberg, University of Missouri; "The Athenian Agora, 1949," Homer A. Thompson, The Institute for Advanced Study; "A New Fragment of the *Laudatio Turiae*," Arthur E. Gordon, University of California; "Who Robbed the Graves?" Hazel Palmer, The Institute for Advanced Study.

Third Session, with Richard H. Howland of Johns Hopkins University presiding, "Coins from Terenouthis, Egypt," Dorothy Markham, University of Michigan; "A Snaffle Bit from the Early Villanovan Period," Clark Hopkins, University of Michigan; "The Relief of the *Vicomagistri* from the Cancelleria Palace," Inez Scott Ryberg, Vassar College; "A Bronze Masked Dancer," Dorothy Burr Thompson, The Agora Excavations; "The Origin of Ostracism," Antony E. Raubitschek, Princeton University.

Fourth Session, Charles H. Morgan II of Amherst College presiding, "A Hot Bath of the Greek Period at Corinth," Robert Scranton, Emory University; "Shields of the Herzsprung Type," Hugh Hencken, Harvard University; "A New Peloponnesian Hoard of Alexander and Ptolemaic Silver Coins," David M. Robinson, University of Mississippi; "The Athenian Theater in the Fifth Century," William Bell Dinsmoor, Columbia University; "The New Temple of Samothrace," Phyllis Williams Lehmann, Smith College; "Gold Crowns from Mycenae," Chrysoula P. Cardaras, University of Chicago.

Fifth Session, Richard Stillwell of Princeton University presiding, "The Cow in Greek Art and Cult," Lloyd W. Daly, University of Pennsylvania; "The First Cypriotes," Lawrence Angell, Jefferson Medical College; "Dacians," George M. A. Hanfmann, Harvard University; "Whole-Timber Construction in Prehistoric Central Europe," George H. Allen, Lafayette College; "The Brick-Stamped of Cosa," William Tongue, Uni-

versity of Oklahoma; "Origins of Chthonic Worship," Constantine G. Yavis, Saint Louis University; "A Correlated Chronology for Greek Sculpture and Vase Painting," Sydney D. Markman, Duke University.

Sixth Session for the Reading of Papers, J. Penrose Harland of the University of North Carolina presiding, "Lamps in the Robinson Collection," James C. Rubright, University of Mississippi; "Attic Black-Figured Pelikai," Dietrich von Bothmer, Metropolitan Museum of Art; "The Inscription and Relief of Darius at Bisitun," George G. Cameron, University of Michigan; "Three Portraits of the First Century B.C.," Dorothy K. Hill, The Walters Art Gallery; "Winged Figures," Ilona E. Ellinger, Trinity College; "How the Greeks Got their Black," Raymond S. Stites, National Gallery of Art; "Darius' Letter to Gatas," Francis W. Schehl.

PAUL KLEE RETROSPECTIVE EXHIBITION

The exhibition of Paul Klee's works opened December 21 and will remain in the third floor galleries through February 19, 1950. This retrospective show, assembled by James Thrall Soby and Margaret Miller of the Museum, is drawn largely from the collection of the Paul Klee Foundation of Berne, Switzerland, and contains more than 150 works which have never before been seen in this country. Supplementing the Swiss loans is a small group of American-owned pictures.

AUSTRIAN ART BOOKLET AVAILABLE

A new Austrian Holy Year Booklet containing a list of Austrian art treasures is available upon request from the Austrian State Tourist Department, 48 East 48th St., New York 17, New York.

NEW GALLERY IN BEVERLY HILLS

The Frank Perls Gallery will open at 350 North Camden Drive, Beverly

Hills, California, on January 23rd.

In his new gallery, Mr. Perls will cooperate with five New York galleries to give California residents an opportunity to see a selected representation of 57th Street galleries. M. Knoedler & Co., Pierre Matisse, the Downtown Gallery, the Buchholz Gallery and the Weyhe Gallery will participate by sending pictures and sculpture to this new gallery.

From 1939 to 1942, when Mr. Perls entered the Army, he had a gallery in Los Angeles.

PERSONAL NOTES

Jesse Reed has been appointed instructor of painting and drawing at Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, W.Va.

Frank R. Mauro has been appointed to the staff of the Columbus Art School, Columbus, Ohio.

Vernon C. Porter, former director of the Riverside Museum, has been appointed assistant to the League's executive director.

Martin D. Oberstein is teaching calligraphy and lettering at the California School of Art, Los Angeles.

Peter Oldenburg teaches typography at the Brooklyn Museum Art School, and at the same school Glenn Foss is instructor of lettering and layout.

Edmund D. Lewandowski has joined the faculty of the Department of Art, Florida State University.

Dr. S. Giedion of the Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, Switzerland, will spend the summer term at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as the first holder of a newly founded annual chair. Professor Giedion will have five public lectures on "The Function of Art in Contemporary Life" and a weekly seminar on "Civic Centers and Social Life in Ancient, Mediaeval, Renaissance and Modern Life."

Harry Sternberg is the author of a new book, *Modern Methods and Materials of Etching*, published in November by McGraw-Hill.

Katharine Balfour Green has been appointed instructor of a new class for

adult beginners at the High Museum School of Art in Atlanta.

Martha Wright Ambrose has been appointed instructor of fashion illustration at the New Orleans Academy of Art.

Kenneth E. Foster, Chairman of the Art Department of Pomona College, Claremont, Calif., has written a handbook of *Ancient Chinese Bronzes*, which was published in September 1949. (\$2.50.)

Fletcher Martin has joined the staff of the Department of Art, University of Florida, as Visiting Professor in Art. Mr. Martin's tenure is from Dec. 1, 1949 through June 1, 1950.

Henry Rox, associate professor of art at Mount Holyoke and member of the staff of the Worcester Art Museum, was represented in the 3rd International Exhibition of Sculpture held in Philadelphia (see COLLEGE ART JOURNAL, Autumn, 1949, p. 77).

Clark Winter is now director of the sculpture department at the Kansas City Art Institute. For the past two years he was at Indiana University, where he received the M.F.A. degree, teaching in the sculpture department, headed by Robert Laurent. Last summer he was in charge of the sculpture department at Ohio State University. His name was omitted from the list of sculptor-teachers represented in the 3rd International Exhibition of Sculpture.

Carl Gaertner of the Cleveland Institute of Art attended in January the opening of his one-man show of recent paintings at MacBeth's Galleries.

Sister Mary Noreen, School Sister of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md., exhibited her paintings in the Demotte Gallery in January 1950.

NEW COURSES OFFERED AT IOWA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Seventeen new courses in art will be offered next summer by Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, in recognition of increased student interest

in the field. The new courses cover water color and oil painting, ceramics, design, puppetry, etching and jewelry.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY PLANS SUMMER COURSES

Intensive courses in archives administration, the preservation and interpretation of historic sites and buildings, and genealogical research will be offered by The American University, Washington, D.C., as a part of its summer session beginning June 12, 1950. Organizations cooperating in one or more of the courses include the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the National Park Service, the Maryland Hall of Records, and Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

Further information may be obtained from the Office of the Director, School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, The American University, 1901 F Street N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS PUBLISHES BOOKLET

The Council of the Royal Society of Arts, London, is reprinting the papers relating to museums, which were read at the last session in the form of an illustrated booklet, so that the whole series of seven will be available in a convenient form. The booklet will be on sale on application to the Secretary of the Royal Society of Arts, John Adam Street, Adelphi, London, W.C. 2. The price for the book bound in limp cloth cover is 5/6d. each; bound in cloth-boards 7/6d. each.

WISCONSIN PAINTERS AND SCULPTORS MEET

The annual dinner and business meeting of the Wisconsin Painters and Sculptors was held in Milwaukee at the Walrus Club on Nov. 11, 1949. The following officers were elected: president, Edward A. Boerner; vice president, Dr. La Vera Pohl; secretary, Miss Charlotte Jamor; treasurer, Morley Hicks.

Included in the report of the retiring president, Robert von Neumann, was

the information that \$2,200 in prizes, awards, and purchases was distributed in the annual Wisconsin Exhibition last April.

FILMS AVAILABLE

The Garrett Gallery, 47 East 12th St., New York 3, N.Y., announces the availability of two films, "Round Trip in Modern Art" (animated color film, 7 min.) and "Toccata Manhatta" (animated color film, 16 mm, 5 min.). Currently in production are "Cineplastic I," "Optical Symphony," "Prelude II" and "Dewdrop." The Gallery will gladly furnish additional information.

EXHIBITIONS AVAILABLE

Bulletin No. 43 of the Kansas State Federation of Art, dated Sept. 15, 1949, contains detailed information regarding their circulating exhibitions for this year. Copies of this bulletin may be obtained from John F. Helm, Jr., Director of the Kansas State Federation of Art, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas.

WYETH PAINTING GIVEN TO MAINE

A water color painting, *Duck Pond*, by Andrew Wyeth has been presented to the University of Maine art gallery by an anonymous donor. The painting will be placed on permanent exhibition in the art gallery in Carnegie Hall.

HOFSTRA COLLEGE EXHIBITS WORK OF 19TH C. ITALIAN

Hofstra College presented the recently discovered works of the 19th century Italian artist, Enrico Francioli, in November. This was the first American showing of the 23 paintings by this relatively unknown artist.

COLOR LITHOGRAPHY BIENNIAL

Gustave von Groschwitz, Curator of Prints, Cincinnati Art Museum, has announced plans for the 1st Biennial International of Contemporary Color Lithography, March 2 to April 6, 1950, at the Museum.

ternational of Contemporary Color Lithography, March 2 to April 6, 1950, at the Museum.

SUMMER ART PROJECT

Alexander Dobkin, Parsons School of Design, New York, will conduct an Art Appreciation program in Europe during July and August of the coming summer. The project comprises five weeks of travel in Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and France, followed by two weeks in a villa on the Normandy coast for painting and recreation. Visits to museums and galleries, meetings with prominent artists, and ample time for leisure in Nice, Venice, Florence and Paris are special features of the plan.

Booklet and additional information can be obtained from the Executive Secretary, Irma S. Jonas, 238 East 23rd St., New York 10, N.Y.

MEXICAN ART WORKSHOP

The Mexican Art Workshop, a project in art education and cultural relations, announces its Fourth Session in Taxco, Mexico, from July 10 to August 15 during the coming summer. The program comprises one week of residence in Mexico City and four weeks of Workshop in Taxco.

The Mexican Art Workshop is connected with the Summer School of the National University of Mexico which grants four credits to members completing the five-week session. Carlos Merida acts as Director.

Information regarding application and registration in the Workshop can be obtained from Irma S. Jonas, Executive Director, 238 East 23rd St., New York 10, N.Y.

LOAN EXHIBITION OF REMBRANDT

A selected Loan Exhibition of Rembrandt's masterpieces is being held at Wildenstein Galleries, New York, from Jan. 19 to Feb. 25, for the benefit of the Public Education Association, under

the patronage of Dr. Eelco N. van Kleffens, Ambassador of the Netherlands.

The show includes 28 paintings, 11 drawings, and a group of etchings from public and private collections. The catalogue contains reproductions of all the paintings on display.

NEW PROGRAM AT UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Dean Sidney W. Little has announced that the University of Oregon school of architecture and allied arts will go on an upper division basis effective with the fall term of 1950. This will require junior standing in college for admission to the school.

The change does not alter degree requirements which will remain at five years for architecture and interior design and four years for general art. Sufficient non-specialized courses in architecture and art are being retained at the freshman and sophomore level to satisfy recommendations by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture for continuous training.

SUMMER SCHOOL IN VIENNA

The summer school of the University of Vienna opens in Schloss Traunsee in Gmunden in the Salzkammergut July 23rd and continues through Sept. 2nd. Courses in the History of Art are included in the program and will be offered in English. Details may be obtained from the Institute of International Education, 2 West 45th St., New York, N.Y.

SILVERSMITHING WORKSHOP CONFERENCE

Applications for the competition for fellowships in the fourth national Silversmithing Workshop Conference for art teachers and supervisors which Handy and Harman organize and sponsor each summer as part of their non-profit educational program, are available by writing the Craft Service Department, Handy and Harman, 82 Fulton St., New York

7. The deadline for entries is April 1. The conference will be held this year at the School for American Craftsmen, which is now a part of the Institute of Technology in Rochester, N.Y.

This intensive four-week course opens on July 31 and ends August 25. Reginald H. Hill, British silversmith, designer and teacher, will conduct the conference which will be under the direction of Margaret Craver, consulting silversmith to Handy and Harman and head of their Craft Service Department.

A limited number of teachers will be chosen to attend the conference by an art jury who will judge them on their feeling for design rather than accomplishment in metal. Applicants need not have worked in metal before in order to be eligible at the conference. They must hold teaching posts at universities, colleges, art or high schools in the United States or Canada.

MASKOID USED IN SILK-SCREEN PRINTING

William Boughton, associate professor of art at the Florida State University in Tallahassee, has found that the use of Maskoid in silk-screen printing speeds up the process, lowers the cost, and offers greater technical freedom.

Andred Jeri, New York manufacturer of the product, plans to bring out a special adaptation of the product designed exclusively for the silk-screen as the result of Prof. Boughton's experiments.

U. OF ILLINOIS REPORTS

The 26th Faculty Art Exhibition by members of the faculty of the department of art, University of Illinois was held from Oct. 23 to Nov. 13, 1949. Those represented in the exhibition were La Force Bailey, Edward Betts, Jane Burke Betts, C. Earl Bradbury, Carleton W. Briggs, Nicholas Britsky, William C. Collins, Charles A. Dietemann, C. V. Donovan, Warren F. Doolittle, Robert L. Drummond, George Ehrlich, George N. Foster, James Den-

ton Hogan, Richard E. Hult, James Jameson, William Kennedy, Keith Kitts, Sol Le Witt, James H. Lynch, Marvin Martin, Leon Morganstern, William T. Moses, Arthur J. Pulos, John Raushenberger, Harold A. Schultz, Leopold B. Segedin, James Shipley, Mark Sprague, Bacia Stepper, Elizabeth Turner, Louise M. Woodroffe and Nicola Ziroti.

Mrs. Leah Trelease, formerly dean of women at the University will serve as coordinator of all committees for the University's third annual Festival of Contemporary Arts, Feb. 26-April 3, Rexford Newcomb, dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, announced.

The Festival, which last year drew more than 40,000 visitors, is designed to attract to the Illinois campus the best in contemporary art, architecture, landscape architecture, music, literature, cinema, dance, and drama.

Mrs. Trelease will integrate the program planning and publication work of all departments participating in the festival with exhibits, concerts, lectures, plays, and various other events. The newly-appointed coordinator is a former resident of Decatur and taught in the high school there before joining the U. of I. English faculty. She was dean of women from 1945 to 1948, when she resigned to return to teaching.

Peter H. Selz, an instructor in art at the University of Illinois' Navy Pier division, has been awarded a Fulbright Fellowship for the study of French painting since the war. He left early in February to spend nine months at the University of Paris.

Selz received his master's degree in art from the University of Chicago last winter and joined the staff at Navy Pier as an instructor in art history in September. He is the author of numerous book reviews in the art field.

Canio Radice, a Chicago painter who recently completed work for a master's degree in art history from the University of Chicago joined the Navy Pier faculty this semester to teach art history.

The University of Illinois' third Na-

tional Exhibition of American Painting will be held in Urbana, Feb. 26 through April 2, as part of the University's annual Festival of Contemporary Arts. The sum of \$7,500 is again available for purchase awards, the prize paintings to become part of the University's permanent collection. This year, instead of inviting an outside jury to select the prize paintings, as was the case in 1948 and 1949, the Department of Art will be its own jury, and will not announce its choices until near the end of the show. Lamar Dodd, painter and head of the Department of Art, University of Georgia, will be a visitor for a week during the period of the exhibition, giving one public lecture-demonstration, and meeting informally with students at other times. Other lectures on the exhibition will be given by Kenneth E. Hudson, dean, St. Louis School of Fine Arts; Daniel Catton Rich, director, Chicago Art Institute; and Earle Ludgin, president, Society for Contemporary American Art.

SARNOFF AND WRIGHT AWARDED PETER COOPER MEDALS

Brigadier General David Sarnoff, chairman of Radio Corporation of America, and Frank Lloyd Wright, architect, were awarded Peter Cooper Medals for the Advancement of Science and Art, respectively, at Convocation ceremonies honoring Cooper Union's 90th anniversary, Wednesday evening, Nov. 2.

PRINTS ADDED TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS COLLECTION

The Library's collection of fine prints was augmented during the year by 505 engravings, etchings, lithographs, and block prints, received by purchase, gift, copyright deposit, and exchange. The majority of the acquisitions comprised the selections of the Pennell Fund Committee which are purchased by the Library with funds bequeathed for this purpose by Joseph Pennell.

Recent prints by American artists were for the most part chosen from the 33rd Annual Exhibition of the Society of American Etchers, Gravers, Lithographers and Woodcutters and from the 7th National Exhibition of Prints held at the Library from May 1 until Aug. 1.

MILLER EXHIBITION AT ASL

An exhibition of 20 paintings by Kenneth Hayes Miller, dating from 1911 to 1948 and loaned by the Phillips Memorial Gallery, the Whitney Museum of American Art, the Metropolitan Museum and private collectors, commemorated Mr. Miller's 38th year as an Art Students League instructor. During this time, the following American artists have studied under him: Peggy Bacon, George Bellows, Isabel Bishop, Alexander Brook, Lynn and Dean Fawcett, Lloyd Goodrich, Edward Hopper, Charles Howard, Rockwell Kent, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Edward Lanning, Reginald Marsh, Kimon Nicolaides, William Palmer, Katherine Schmidt, Henry Snakenberg and Denys Wortman.

6TH INTERNATIONAL TEXTILE EXHIBITION HELD

The sixth annual International Textile Exhibition was held during November at Weatherspoon Art Gallery at Woman's College of University of North Carolina. Twenty-eight of the seventy-six pieces displayed were selected for purchase awards ranging from \$20 to \$100. Artists and designers from 13 states and Canada were represented.

The jury of selection and awards was composed of Anni Albers, formerly of Black Mountain College; Michelle Murphy, of Brooklyn Museum; and Prof. Noma Hardin, exhibition director, of Woman's College art faculty.

BECKMANN RETROSPECTIVE IN PORTLAND

Twenty-two oil paintings, seven water colors and fourteen prints by Max Beckmann, circulated by the American Fed-

eration of Arts, were shown this fall at the Portland (Ore.) Art Museum.

With this group, the Museum showed 12 Beckmann prints lent by Mr. Gordon Gilkey, dean of the art department of Oregon State College.

BOOK CATALOGUE PUBLISHED

H. Felix Kraus, Books International-Prints International, 680 West End Ave., New York 25, has announced that an illustrated catalogue with over 1500 titles has just been issued, listing many items that have just been published or have been unavailable in this country for many years. It will be sent upon request.

C. Conde Kennedy, formerly of the Raymond & Raymond Galleries, is now associated with Mr. Kraus. The firm will be happy to arrange exhibits of prints and imported art books for educational institutions.

UPPER MIDWEST SHOW

The 2nd Biennial Six-State Exhibition of Paintings and Prints, held at the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, included 84 paintings and prints which were selected from 650 works submitted by 390 artists. The jury members were Hans Moller, painter, New York City; Egbert Jacobson, director, Department of Design, Container Corporation of America, Chicago; and Eloise Spaeth, chairman, Exhibition Committee, American Federation of Arts, Washington, D.C.

The award winners were as follows: First awards in painting—Byron Burford, Iowa, and Raymond Parker, Minnesota. Second awards—Raymond Parker and John Martin Socha, Minnesota. Third awards—Stuart Edie, Iowa, and John Kirsch, Nebraska. First awards in prints—Mauricio Lasansky, Iowa, and William McCloy, Iowa. Second award—Mauricio Lasansky. Third awards—Robert L. Knipschild, Wisconsin, and Otto Ocvirk, Iowa.

Following the close of the exhibition at the Art Center on Jan. 22, 1950, a

selection of 36 pieces will be placed on a nation-wide circuit by the American Federation of Arts.

CLEVELAND INSTITUTE EXHIBITS

The annual Faculty Exhibition of the Cleveland Institute of Art opened Dec. 4, 1949. Exhibitors were Clayton Bachtel, Kenneth Bates, Louis Bosa, Jack M. Burton, Kae Dorn Cass, Joseph Ceruti, Marco Demarco, Hugo Dizinno, Peter Paul Dubaniewicz, William J. Eastman, Edris Eckhardt, Otto F. Ege, Anthony Eterovich, Carl Gaertner, Ugo Graziotti, Jean Moodey Heffter, Charles Jeffery, Fred Miller, John Paul Miller, Leon Gordon Miller, Charles F. Mosgo, Hans Alexander Mueller, Virginia Nepodal, Arthur J. Pulos, Howard J. Reid, Dorothy Rigdon, Laurence Schmeckebier, William Schock, Viktor Schreckengost, Rita Roszkowicz Severyn, Glenn M. Shaw, Walter Sinz, Rolf Stoll, Iva Goldhamer Stone, John Teyral, Paul B. Travis, Mildred Watkins, William Ward, Frank N. Wilcox, Thelma Frazier Winter, and Quinter Young.

The program for January included a week of demonstrations in sculptural techniques by Randolph Wardell Johnston, associate professor of Smith College, who taught a group of twenty-five students especially selected for the course.

On Feb. 5 an exhibition of paintings by George Grosz opened in the Institute gallery with the artist himself present to greet guests. The following evening Mr. Grosz addressed members of the Print Club on "A Piece of My World."

NETHERLANDS INSTITUTE ANNOUNCES SUMMER COURSE

The Netherlands Institute for History of Art is organizing its third summer course, which will be held from Aug. 1 to Aug. 21, 1950. The main theme of the course will be "The Art of Holland and Its Relation to Other Countries."

Applications must be received before June 1, 1950, and should be addressed to the Secretary of the Summer Course, *Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie*, Korte Vijverberg 7, The Hague. Further information will gladly be given by the Secretary.

COLLABORATIVE COMPETITION ANNOUNCED

The program for the Collaborative Competition has been announced by the Association of the Alumni of the American Academy in Rome. The competition is open to teams composed of students of three or more of the arts of painting, sculpture, architecture and landscape architecture. Two prizes of \$200 and \$100 will be awarded to those teams submitting designs judged by the jury to be the most successful as collaborative efforts. The jury will be composed of American Academy in Rome alumni and other representatives of the arts, which will be announced later.

Drawings are to be delivered to the American Academy in Rome, 101 Park Ave., New York 17, N.Y. on or before April 10, 1950. Details of the competition may be obtained from this address.

TIFFANY APPLICATIONS ACCEPTED

The Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation is now ready to receive applications for the 1950 Scholarship Awards.

A number of scholarships carrying cash grants up to \$2,000 will be made to students of painting, sculpture and the graphic arts. The scholarships are intended for men and women of unusual talent and personal qualifications, who have already demonstrated their capacity for sustained effort in the creative arts. Scholarships are open to men and women under thirty-five years of age, married or unmarried, who are citizens of the United States, irrespective of race or creed.

Applications must be made in writing by the candidates themselves and ad-

dressed to Tiffany Foundation, 1083 Fifth Avenue, New York 28, N.Y., and should be received prior to July 1, 1950.

AKRON OPENS NEW ART CENTER

Fire destroyed the building occupied by the Akron Art Institute in January, 1942. Eight years later a modern museum building, given the Institute by the city and remodeled through the generosity of the people of Akron, was opened on Jan. 15, 1950.

Operating in temporary quarters for four years, the Institute achieved the support of an active membership of 1,500, in part industrial, the launching of a progressive exhibition program and the initiation of a four-year professional school which trains students in advertising and industrial design. This progress was made under the leadership of Walter P. Keith, president, and Charles Val Clear, former director, who is now in charge of the Florida Gulf Coast Art Center.

George D. Culler, director, looks forward to constant growth and service to the community in the building which was especially designed for flexible expansion.

ARCHITECTURAL BOOKS

The library of the University of Minnesota informs us that they have a few extra copies of Henry-Russell Hitchcock's *American Architectural Books* available for sale at the regular price of \$6 a copy. Any one wishing a copy of this indispensable reference book may write directly to Mrs. Evelyn Reynolds at the

University Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 14, Minn.

JOHN SLOAN MEMOIRS

The Whitney Museum of American Art is collaborating with Mrs. John Sloan in gathering material for John Sloan's memoirs and would like to borrow letters written by him or the late Mrs. Dolly Sloan. Also, two early paintings by Sloan have not yet been located, "The Little Dark Street" and "Targets" (or "Shooting Gallery").

Information about the letters or pictures should be addressed to Miss Rosalind Irvine, Assistant Curator, Whitney Museum of American Art, 10 West 8th St., New York 11, N.Y.

CLARENCE CARTER WEEK

The New Century Club in Portsmouth, Ohio, is sponsoring a Clarence Carter Week, opening April 14, in honor of its most distinguished native-born artist. Twin features of the celebration are a one-man show of Carter's best known oils and water colors from various American museums and an open competition of local professional and amateur artists with the purpose of developing native talent and popular interest in the arts.

WACHSMANN NAMED TO RESEARCH POSITION

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, dean of engineering at the Institute of Design of the Illinois Institute of Technology, announced that Konrad Wachsmann, architect and designer, has been named professor in charge of advanced building research and design.

book reviews

ARNOLD SILCOCK, *Introduction to Chinese Art and History*, 256 p., 32 ill. (four in color), 15 text fig. "First American edition, revised and enlarged" from English edition of 1935. New York, Oxford University Press, 1948. \$5.00.

When this reviewer's long struggle with the Japanese language reached the level of the *Kokka*, he came to form a vivid mental image of the Japanese art historian of that time, and of the conditions under which he wrote. A typical *Kokka* article, say on "The Significance of Painting in the Far East," would meander amiably among generalities, stopping but seldom to examine anything specific and then never long enough for a footnote. One imagined its writer as an elderly gentleman, stiff in the joints, kneeling at a low table in a room whose winter chill was mitigated only by a charcoal burner at his elbow. His reference books would be on a shelf across the room. How uncomfortable to pull one's self up and go out into the cold for nothing more important than a date or a page number! How much more agreeable to write on a plane that made such discomfort unnecessary!

Years later, on reading Mr. Silcock, your reviewer has been visited by a comparable image. The details naturally differ. This is a gentleman who writes on long week-ends in the country, braced by walks over the moors. He has, in addition to memories of residence in China, a small but well-thumbed shelf of the indispensable books he came to value years ago. On Wednesday mornings in town he sometimes calls up a friend in

the British Museum, to fill in some small gap. The result, as presented in his *Introduction*, is a book that may well appeal to a large group of readers (which your reviewer is again capable of visualizing, since in respect to a book called, say, "An Introduction to the Economic History of Modern Europe" he might well form a part of it). One has a vague interest, aroused by a conversation or a piece in the paper, or here perhaps by a museum exhibit. The American passion for self-improvement leads to the purchase of a book, particularly a small, nicely-printed book. Left conspicuously for some time on the living-room table, the book is sampled, perhaps even read to the end; the passion is appeased, and the subject passes quickly into that limbo of the mind where memory is feeblest.

For such a purpose Mr. Silcock's slim volume is admirably adapted. Its pages invite the lazy eye by their smallness and legibility. The illustrations are attractive. The style is a comfortable compromise between, say, the long drawn out raptures of Binyon and the bristling objectivity of Goodrich. The casual reader of an introduction will have no way of discovering the author's factual errors or misinterpretations, or the wide gaps in his knowledge. The lapses that in a more vividly and precisely written book might spread a wrong impression here will pass almost unnoticed in a general amorphousness. If the reader perseveres he will emerge—not with a series of gross misconceptions, for nothing will have impressed him clearly enough—but with a vague benevolence toward the Chinese, who seem to have been a gifted people in their time, though of course that was long ago.

The professionals into whose midst Mr. Silcock has strolled, will have little difficulty in sizing him up. His knowledge of, and attitude toward, the problems of art history in general may be glimpsed in two quotations:

"It is an archaic style, yet one that is entirely charming."

(Concerning the extremely primitive juxtaposition of archer and isolated mountain motif in the scroll of "Admonitions,") "Ku K'ai-chih was the first to use mountains, rivers, and trees as the indispensable setting and background for some of his subjects. This is astonishing when it is remembered that a similar correlation of figures with natural scenery, as in 'The Hunter,' occurred in the West only with the Italian Renaissance. 'The Tempest' by Giorgione has been described as a forerunner of the first school of landscape painting in Europe, and Giorgione lived at the close of the fifteenth century in Europe—eleven hundred years after Ku K'ai-chih."

Only a very fragmentary knowledge of the facts of Chinese art history fortify this central naivete. What Mr. Silcock has learned he cannot reproduce without falling continually into misstatement or distortion. His knowledge is disastrously incomplete both temporally and spatially. He seems to have read nothing of importance in twenty years of extremely important discoveries and new theories; thus his discussion of early Chinese bronzes was apparently written in ignorance of Karlgren, Bachhofer, Waterbury, or Ch'en Meng-chia. Only out of such a vacuum would it be possible for him to present the whole development of the Chou bronze style as a long process of petrification, in which "the Chinese genius for preserving and formalizing choked the genius for free artistic expression." His ignorance of a whole generation of painting criticism is similarly revealed when he says of Ma Yüan that "perhaps the most splendid of his richly filled landscapes is that in the Freer collection." That was the attribution of Binyon, more excusable since it was based on enthusiasm and unfamiliarity; but it has been obvious for decades that the Freer scroll stands in somewhat the same relation to the real Ma Yüan as a below-

average Sodoma to the "Mona Lisa." His bibliography is so far out of date that it lacks even the later writings of so noticeable a writer as Oswald Siren. He omits Siren's *Chinese on the Art of Painting*, which has been a bad book but probably an indispensable one since 1936; he has caught Siren's *History of Early Chinese Painting*, published in 1931, but not the equally monumental continuation on later painting, out in 1938. Though he speaks often of calligraphy, he mentions neither of the two good books, by Driscoll and Chiang Yee. He writes (most confusingly) about An-yang and the Chou conquest with apparently no knowledge of Creel's *Birth of China*. Equally damaging, from the modern standpoint, is his ignorance of the late forms of Chinese painting that to the Chinese, and to the most experienced Westerners, are more stimulating than any other. Like the Baroque in the hands of a nineteenth century critic, these are dismissed with a few sentences on the decadence of the art and—God save the mark!—its lack of spontaneity.

The other disastrous limitation in the author's equipment is a pure provincialism. He shows himself truly familiar only with Chinese art in London (and only with books on Chinese art written by English authors). No one would wish to disparage the collections of the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert, or minimize the debt owed to men like Waley, Hobson, Binyon, or the two Giles. But the pendulum has swung far into another direction; the great collections, if not in Japan, are in Toronto, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, Kansas City; most of the vigorous modern scholarship, if not that of the younger Japanese, is being produced in America. Mr. Silcock's book—presented in an American edition with almost all its illustrations drawn from the backwater of English collections—makes to an experienced American eye the impression that an

Englishman might receive from reading a book on Italian art written by a Canadian, with bibliography and illustrations drawn entirely from a Canadian environment.

Mr. Silcock was rash in undertaking his book; his publishers were singularly ill-advised to undertake an American edition, at least from the standpoint of their prestige with art historians. All this, however, is a peccadillo, and the reader's five dollars will at least give him one remarkably handsome color reproduction. As a travesty on great Chinese art, the recently exposed Bahr collection of paintings in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, is more consistent (since even the method of display is there thoroughly disagreeable); is vastly more expensive; and presents a much more complicated problem of ultimate disposal.

ALEXANDER C. SOPER
Bryn Mawr College

CHARLES E. GAUSS, *The Aesthetic Theories of French Artists*, 111 p. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1949. \$3.00.

The title of Mr. Gauss' book is somewhat misleading, for he limits himself to the esthetic theories of French artists since the middle of the last century. Within these limitations Mr. Gauss follows the esthetic developments as expounded in the writings of leading artist-theoreticians beginning with Courbet and ending with Dali. (Some non-French writers on esthetics are included.) In each case the author compares the esthetics with its parallel in philosophy or science. He never falls into the easy pitfall of attempting to show a cause-effect relationship between the philosophy or science and the esthetics of a particular era, but is content simply to point out their similarities.

The book begins with the examination of Courbet's manifestoes of realism, published in 1855 and again in 1861. A comparison is drawn between Courbet's writings and the positivist esthetics

of Auguste Comte and P. J. Proudhon. To all of them art was to be the objective representation of reality as seen by the artist, who is a product of his time. Then by stressing the importance of the process of selection, Hyppolyte Taine—according to Gauss—provided the philosophical transition from positivist realism to its "historical consequents," which was paralleled in painting by impressionism and neo-impressionism. For the esthetics of these two movements he examines the writings of Manet, Pissarro, Signac, and Seurat and stresses the well-known connection between developments in physics and the painters' concern with light and color. In Cézanne he sees the continuation of the positivist-realist stream. But the emphasis has changed from light and color to depth and space. Cézanne, starting from a positivist basis, recognizes the subjective element of the artist, a striking parallel to the new positivism of Poincaré. Both consider the foremost goal of art or physics to bring organization into the world of nature. Cubism—and its variations: constructivism, neo-plasticism, purism, orphism—is still in the realist stream. Gauss analyzes the doctrines of cubism as first pronounced by Gleizes and Metzinger in 1912. The cubists consider themselves realists, but their realism means the representation of the real and permanent world ("plastic truth") rather than of the visible world. The difference is primarily one between visual and pictorial space. Gauss sees a parallel between the esthetics of the cubists and Meyerson's attempt in philosophy to find permanence within change, as well as Bertrand Russell's emphasis on "construction rather than inference" in the physical world.

In contrast to the stream of realism, which Gauss traces from Courbet through cubism, he sees in modern French art another trend which begins with Renoir. Renoir stressed irregularity as the principle of vitality in art. In his esthetics is found the separation of art from science and reason, with art operat-

ing on the intuitive level. The philosophical parallel is Bergsonian metaphysics. Renoir's "aesthetic intuition" is developed further in the primitivism and symbolism of Gauguin. Here the artist, seeking a conscious return to primitivism, separates himself completely from science, realism and the concept of progress and returns to an emotional romanticism. This ideology is carried on by the symbolist school of Denis and by Matisse and the Fauves, to which Gauss sees a counterpart in Croce's esthetics, as well as a relationship to the theories of empathy as advanced in Germany by Robert Vischer and Theodor Lipps. This tendency toward the intuitive and anti-rational is brought to a climax in surrealism, derived directly from the nihilistic attitude of dadaism. A more positive structure is achieved, however, by André Breton, the formulator of surrealist theory. Surrealism substitutes the world of the unconscious for the world of exterior nature. The personal symbolism of the artist may have no communicative meaning, but then surrealism places no value in esthetics. Gauss sees a parallel between surrealism and non-Euclidian geometry, but its origin is found directly in Freud and its affinity is actually closest to Jung's "collective unconscious." Gauss provides a good criticism of surrealism, where he sees the problem of the painter becoming the problem of psychology, which forsakes the realist tradition to revert to a new mythology in which the artist is reduced to a passive instrument.

The book is excellently organized and carefully indexed. It is filled with well-translated quotations from the most important writings of leading artists of the period. It has a large and excellent bibliography of items indispensable for anyone who wishes to understand late nineteenth and twentieth century developments in art. For these reasons, if for no others, the book will be of value to everyone interested in esthetics as propounded by artists.

But it might have been a great deal

more. It could have made a significant contribution to the history of culture. The author has carefully analyzed the esthetics of the artists, aided by liberal use of excellent quotations, yet he has failed to do this for the philosophies on which he draws for comparison. Too often he fails to document these or relies on secondary source material, as when he documents his discussion of Lobatchewsky's geometry with an essay by Gaston Bachelard.

The inclusion of the esthetics of such men as Théophile Gautier and Fromentin, and their reaction against realism, as well as the esthetics of the Academy would have made for a more rounded treatment of the subject. The author might also have investigated the still rather speculative but important questions of a possible influence of the concept of the fourth dimension and the space-time continuum on cubism, and of a concurrence between the rationally conceived theory of cubism and the intellectualized esthetics of Jacques Maritain.

While pointing out certain parallels between esthetics and philosophy, Mr. Gauss fails to go to the more fundamental problem of how cubism and fauvism, or constructivism and surrealism could originate in the same cultural climate.

But Mr. Gauss is primarily concerned with the esthetic theories of the artists themselves. These, he states, are even more important for the spectator than the literary preface for the reader. Yet an adequate critical test of the esthetics of the various artists against their own paintings would have been desirable. How significant, after all, is the symbolist theory of a Maurice Denis in view of his rather saccharine painting, and how important are Dali's "irrational explanations," when we actually look at one of his paintings, where almost everything seems to be derived from Renaissance sketchbooks?

PETER SELZ
University of Illinois

OLIVER W. LARKIN, *Art and Life in America*, xviii + 547 p., 419 ill. New York, Rinehart & Company, 1949. \$6.00.

Here is a broad picture of art and life in America—not strictly a history of art, but a history of the cultural development of our country as shown in its artistic production. Art here is not limited to pictures and sculpture, though the former provides the main bulk of the book, but is an integration of architecture, painting, sculpture and the decorative arts: in short, all the visual arts except the dance and the moving picture. To attempt this in one volume is a tremendous undertaking. The author has done so with great sweeps, with details fluently and often spicily drawn, subordinated to the rapid flow of the development of the history of the arts in America. (America is here used in a limited provincial sense as the United States and its colonial origins.)

Though this is not a detailed history of American painting, it offers as comprehensive a picture of this specialized field as has yet been made. That it will take its place along with Dunlap and Tuckerman as a source work is doubtful. Nor can it be said to replace Isham and Cortisoz as a history of American art, though it does include a vast amount of important material not in that standard work. Active scholarship in our American cultural past has brought to light and re-evaluated in the past two decades a great deal of source material. Larkin's book is, therefore, a considerably broadened and enriched view of American art. The extent of this enrichment is suggested by thirty-two pages of index—three columns to the page.

The work is arranged chronologically in six "books"—The Colonial Arts; Self-conscious Republic; Democratic Vistas; Between Two Panics (1870-1900); Progressivism, Culture, and War (to 1930); New Horizons. Each in turn is divided in two or three "parts," each preceded by an introduction of five or more pages and followed by two or three

chapters of approximately eight to twelve pages in length. The book, in addition, has three special features: its chapter headings, the Bibliographical Notes, and its illustrations.

The chapter headings when studied in themselves are profoundly provocative both individually and in their sequence and order. For example, under Book One, The Colonial Arts, we have "Part I—Saints and Traders," followed by "A Sensible People," "The Serviceable Carpenter" and "The Limner." In Book Five after "Part II—Art's Coming of Age," is "Art and Mr. Podsnap," "Ructions in the Hennerly" and "Explosion in the Armory." These are headings which reveal careful integration and planning by the author and which if used for their poetic and literary suggestion will give added interest to the author's theses. For the impatient, however, they will prove a real handicap when using the book as a reference source.

The thirty-one pages of Bibliographical Notes are invaluable, and will be found *very* useful by teachers of American art history, American history or of American culture, as a reading guide for further study. They are arranged by sections following the order of the text, rather than alphabetically, and as such may be found to have special value. Regrettably, though the remainder of the book is carefully indexed, this useful section does not seem to have been included—an omission which greatly handicaps its potential usefulness.

The happy and pertinent selection of illustrations should be roundly applauded. That they are not all included either by author or title in the general index will not trouble those familiar with the subject, as they are well placed through the book and immediately connected with the related text. The author has skillfully used details, or works entire to further the impression he is trying to create of each period—a real aid and a constructive addition to the text. The book unfortunately puts its poorest foot forward in illustrations because the

frontispiece, of C. W. Peale's sons on the staircase, which is again in the text, p. 117, in identical size and better printing, is, as are all the illustrations, in black and white and is one of the poorest reproductions in the book.

The format of the book is in handy size, 11 x 8, but heavy, being printed on coated paper with good readable type in double columns to the page. One wishes its typography and layout, which have a utilitarian suggestion, were done with finesse equal to the selection of the illustrations or the thought expended on the chapter headings. It tends to add, rather than detract from the first impression the book gives, of being cluttered and over worked in details—an impression which is entirely erroneous. Professor Larkin deserves nothing but great praise and admiration for this undertaking. It will possibly be the forerunner of a number of such works, compiled we suspect, by others lacking the thorough background and insight of the present author.

JOHN DAVIS HATCH, JR.
Norfolk Museum,
Norfolk, Virginia

ERWIN E. CHRISTIANSEN, *Popular Art in the United States*, 31 p., 32 pl. London, Penguin Books, 1948. 75 cents.

The publishers of the King Penguin Books have added a new volume to the well-deservedly popular series. They merit high commendation for their ability to produce such valuable little volumes at so modest a cost to the purchaser. This new addition is no exception. Although primarily a picture-book, the text is concise and serves as a useful introduction to the plates. The author's "Notes on the Illustrations" consider stylistically and historically the essential qualities of each object reproduced. He has done well in this direction, for the introductory text permits necessarily only a consideration of the "popular arts" on broadly general terms. This method of division of the text results in

a simplicity and a clarity that might serve well as a prototype for small volumes of this kind. An adequate, although not definitive, bibliography is also appended.

There are thirty-two illustrations, including sixteen in full color. Considering the small format and other conceivable limitations, the color reproductions are admirable in bringing to the reader the charm and vitality of the American folk arts. Within this color group are introduced a variety of objects, with provenance, type, and material well considered. The remarkably fine quality of the drawings of the Index of American Design is again emphasized in this selection.

This volume should prove of some value to the student. As an outstanding example of what can be accomplished at the low cost level, it might be held up as a model which publishers in this country would do well to emulate.

E. MAURICE BLOCH
The Cooper Union Museum
for the Arts of Decoration

THOMAS CREIGHTON, ed., *Building for Modern Man, A Symposium*, xvi + 219 p. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1949. \$3.50.

What do architects think or do they have enough to do without undertaking to be philosophers, too? In 1947 Princeton invited an outstanding group of first and second generation modern architects to meet to discuss architectural problems. As one of the guests, I can say that it was an extraordinarily valuable experience, the good features of a convention raised to the nth power. Thomas Creighton has undertaken in this book the admittedly impossible task of recording the symposium. Impossible because the vibrant atmosphere could better be recorded in paint than words, and because reactions to the various individual speeches were as important to the other participants as the speeches themselves. Each member of the symposium took away with him memories

filtered and selected by his own intelligence, which presumably is what each reader of the collected papers will do, minus, of course, the charge of personal dynamics which each speaker added to his prepared paper in delivery. Mr. Creighton, by his careful introductions, interpolations, and summaries, has supplied essential links, and has related the diverse expressions of similar themes in a masterful way. Nevertheless, the book remains a collection of fragments. This defect could only have been overcome by a totally different approach to the writing of it, that is, a book by Mr. Creighton in which his recollections, comments, and analysis, were the book itself, with perhaps a few papers such as those by Gropius, Howe, and Hamlin, added as an appendix. Had this been done a more coherent statement of the nature of architecture, as it appeared to its foremost practitioners in 1947, might have resulted. As it is, the reader may be able to construct such a statement for himself and he may not. The papers may be likened to the successive flashes that appear as a multifaceted jewel is turned in the hand. Each successive flash is true, but one cannot experience the quality, extent and completeness of the whole. Certainly the fault is not with the personnel of the conference which was representative, catholic and on the whole articulate, though a few were merely rhetorical and others platitudinous.

It becomes increasingly distressing that no widely accepted architectural philosophy has appeared comparable in breadth to the range of recent architectural accomplishment, although modern architecture is at least four decades old. We still have only the familiar doctrines of strong individualists like Gropius and Wright, or the more pragmatic schools also represented at Princeton. There was, however, a notable degree of accord on the reality and importance of architecture as an esthetic medium. Its specific character was not defined but generally expressed as a vague yearning for some humanistic doctrine to be

based on a deeper knowledge of modern man. The usual things were said about him as compared with his ancestors, but no one was able to be more definite. If desires of this sort are realizable, what have the sociologists and psychologists been doing? It is significant that the most basic and revolutionary conception aired at the conference was Adelbert Ames Jr.'s discoveries of the nature of vision. The implications for architecture were not carried very far, although Mr. Ames made a valiant effort to do so. As was pointed out at the conference, the architect today is too prone to believe that he is a combination of sociologist, psychoanalyst, economist and city planner as well as the conditioner of space for human activities. This presumptuous role, which the confusion of modern life has called into being, is most alarming, particularly since so many of the distinguished contributors to this book subscribe to it. As Arthur Holden points out, the architect should not think himself capable of writing the program, or in more general terms, aspire to reform the world. His role as coordinator is apparently often confused with Superman's. The architect cannot, as Neutra says, solve the problems of mankind with a slide rule, prefabrication or modular coordination. He can by creative intuitive acts give form and meaning to the conclusions of experts in other fields, but he cannot *be* those experts. Architecture cannot as a whole advance further than society.

These strictures are not directed against the book, but rather against the background, since it is unquestionably the most useful compendium of contemporary architectural thought we have. Its shortcomings are those of architecture itself and consequently of our post-war world. Perhaps in 1950 a similar group using this book as a corner stone can raise the building another course or two toward completing the conceptual structure modern man is waiting for.

CARROLL L. V. MEEKS
Yale University

JOSEPH GANTNER, ed., *Burckhardt-Woelfflin-Briefwechsel und andere Dokumente ihrer Begegnung*, 129 p. Basel, Benno Schwabe, 1948. 10 fr.

One of the things which brings a field of learning alive for the student is an awareness of the men who have built it up or contributed to it decisively. Hearing students of Adolph Goldschmidt, Kingsley Porter or Henri Focillon speak about their teachers, one realizes how much the personal relationship between the knower and the learner still means in an age of units, required minors, transfer credits and other mechanized checks on education. There should therefore exist, in all more developed schools, seminars on the great writers and thinkers of art in order to bring about such an awareness of the chosen field. How few students know about Jakob Burckhardt, the man, and about his student Heinrich Woelfflin, whose books they are using, whose ideas are in their subconscious and have become their common property.

Burckhardt's life and personality is richly documented in his poems, in his numerous and wonderful letters, in his collection of extra-academic lectures. Around Woelfflin, on the other hand, there was always an aura of myth and aloofness, and therefore every document appearing after his death arouses expectation. The small volume with letters exchanged between the two men must for this reason be considered an important publication. It has been edited with loving care and accurate knowledge by one of Woelfflin's students, Joseph Gantner, occupying today his teacher's chair in Zuerich. He has not only extracted the forty-four letters from the Jakob Burckhardt Archiv in Basel but has filled in the lacunae between the letters with letters of Woelfflin to his parents pertaining to his teacher and with notes from his diary written with laconic grandeur of style. The time span ranges from the day when the young student first visited Burckhardt to the last letter of the "old

master" written one month before his death. Burckhardt is the livelier letter writer of the two, endowed with a keen sense for the right verbal expression guided by an observant eye. Woelfflin shared these qualities to an unusual degree with his older friend. Yet while he absorbed and developed these features, he went, as a thinker, far beyond the confines of his teacher. This, one clearly discerns from the letters. The gradual emergence of Woelfflin's "Klassische Kunst" can be retraced, accompanied by the shrewd remarks of Burckhardt. In one of his last letters, Woelfflin asks whether he may be permitted to dedicate this book to his teacher, and Burckhardt replies "Unterlassen Sie die Widmung des Buches an mich!—sodann hat es in der vermutlichen Naehе des Endes (und dies bitte ich mir zu glauben). etwas Aengstigendes noch irgendwie in dieser Zeitlichkeit verantwortlich gemacht zu werden." (Translation: "Abstain from dedication to me!—and finally, it has something frightening that so close to the expected end (and please believe it) one would still in some way be made responsible during one's temporal existence.") This quotation may serve as an example for the atmosphere of these letters. Since the German of these writers is of simple lucidity, it should offer little difficulty to the American student with a knowledge of German. He will be rewarded by the contact with two of the last humanists before the cataclysms of the twentieth century.

ALFRED NEUMEYER
Mills College

E. LOUISE LUCAS, *Guides to the Harvard Libraries, No. 2: Fine Arts*, ix + 54 p. Cambridge, Harvard University Library, 1949. 50 cents.

This small but very meaty publication is intended "to help the graduate student find his objectives more quickly than might otherwise be possible." Presumably this means the graduate student at Harvard University. As such it

is surely an invaluable aid. Herein is basic information, specific instruction, and many helpful hints for intelligent use of all of Harvard's Library facilities with especial emphasis on the resources of the Fogg Museum library. Moreover, it is all presented from a background of broad general acquaintance with the art field and a specialized knowledge of a specific situation possessed by few.

Miss Lucas' remarks about the library facilities, although they apply specifically to the Harvard campus, can be given a more general application. College and university library systems in this country usually consist of a general library and various special or departmental libraries. Cataloging and classification policies follow a fairly standard pattern even though they may differ in actual entries and numbers assigned to books. Hence, allowing for local differences, her statements on catalogs and their uses and on the importance of becoming acquainted with all the library facilities of the system are universally true.

The chapter on library tools with its concise, precise descriptions of reference books and aids is especially pertinent. It is divided into the following sections: General Reference Works, Biography, Serials, Directories, Iconography, Special Fields, Library Catalogues and Trade Catalogues. Each section notes outstanding titles indicating content coverage, dates, supplements, etc. The sections on Library and Trade Catalogues merit special attention as revealing sources of reference information unknown to many students.

The Bibliographical Appendix can well serve as an introduction to the wider fields of research materials of interest to art students and also as a buying guide for libraries interested in providing themselves a basis for a strong art collection.

An art student or instructor, possessing this little book with its bibliography checked for call numbers and locations in the particular library system at his disposal, would find himself equipped

with an excellent springboard for any research project.

CERILLA E. SAYLOR
University of Illinois

JOHN REWALD, *Renoir Drawings*, 24 p., 89 pl. New York, H. Bittner & Co., 1946. \$15.00.

Renoir on first consideration comes to mind primarily as a painter rather than a draftsman. No drawings from his early years survive, and while he was closely associated with the impressionists he drew little. As would be expected, his interest in color and light caused him to avoid definite contours and solid surfaces. But from the time when he began to feel "the need for more emphasis on structure" he turned more and more to drawing and from then his manner of drawing paralleled his manner of painting. Returning from a trip to Italy in 1881-82, where he studied Raphael, Renoir began to draw with a precision of line and contour which was comparable to Ingres. He even carried it to the extent of drawing with pen and ink and filling in the outline with color. Soon, however, a synthesis evolved in his work: the active combination of his conception of color and light with his technique as a draftsman.

The drawings reveal clearly Renoir's researches in the mastery of rendering form and volume. He was not a revolutionary; he considered himself to be only continuing what others had done before him. It is not inconceivable to place him as the heir to Watteau and Fragonard, in a line, as Paul Jamot puts it, "of the most charming geniuses of France who created a delight not only for the senses but an instrument of poetry." While Renoir's poetry may have lacked the magic of Watteau's and the elegance of Fragonard's, it was filled with a spontaneous joy and warmth. His work illustrated his theme that a picture should convey pleasure.

The book itself is handsome in format. Two initials, drawn in pen and ink

originally for an article written by Renoir's brother, are incorporated into the two introductory chapters and serve to lend a decorative air to the text and give a hint of the drawings to come in the section of plates. The selection of drawings (89 plus the frontispiece and the two initials) covers a variety of the media which Renoir employed. Crayon, sanguine and pastel drawings form the largest groups. Two of the sanguine drawings as well as the frontispiece, a watercolor, are reproduced in color. The fairly generous size of the page (12 x 9 inches) allows a reasonable representation of the drawings, which in most cases are quite large in scale—number 40, a study for "The Bathers" is 41 x 64 inches. The quality of the reproduction is very high in most cases, although the pastels lose a great deal in the black and white. Number 8, for instance, gives only a suggestion of the lovely blue, violet and red-brown, with a pale green background, of the original.

The plates are arranged as far as was possible in chronological order. They are preceded by a catalogue giving the medium, measurements and collection when known, and usually a brief comment by the author. If the gaps of information of the collections are somewhat frustrating at times, on the other hand many of the drawings have been little known and show frequently a particular phase in Renoir's thought or a facet of his talent as a draftsman.

Mr. Rewald has drawn upon the personal recollections of Renoir's brother, Edmond, for some of the information in the catalogue and he himself supplies a great deal of interesting data, identifying paintings to which the drawings are related and naming the models or sitters who appear in them.

Few persons, if any, could be as well fitted as John Rewald to prepare a book on Renoir. His analyses of the drawings themselves describe the artist and place him and his art within his time, an understanding that is based on Mr. Rewald's broad knowledge of the art of

nineteenth century France and in particular of the impressionist group. This background, combined with a facility for writing direct, lively, stimulating prose have produced a picture book that is as rewarding to read as it is delightful to regard.

ELAINE A. EVANS
Fogg Museum of Art
Harvard University

K. T. PARKER, *Canaletto Drawings at Windsor Castle*, 63 p., 63 ill., 89 pl., frontispiece, 1 map. Oxford and London, Phaidon Press, 1948. \$7.50.

Canaletto Drawings at Windsor Castle is the sixth in the series of books on that fabulous collection of drawings. Like the others, it is bound in red, lettered in gold, is profusely illustrated and fully annotated.

In this case, the introduction and catalogue have been written by K. T. Parker, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. He has not only given us a careful consideration in the catalogue of each of the drawings, but in the introduction, relates the fascinating history of the collector from whom the Canaletto drawings were purchased for the Royal Library and goes on to give a general discussion of Canaletto as a draftsman.

Joseph Smith, the source of the Canaletto collection, became the British Consul in Venice in the year 1740. He had probably been in Venice since the early years of the eighteenth century. Mr. Parker sheds new light on his widely discussed and much disputed personality. He makes Smith out to be not as Horace Walpole characterized him, "the Merchant of Venice," but as a collector who was at the same time a dealer, playing a minor rôle as a patron. Smith apparently appreciated fully from the point of view of a connoisseur what he gathered into his large collection, yet he was always aware of its commercial value. He makes it clear in his will (which is printed in its entirety with other material pertinent to the sale of the collection, in the section of the book

labelled "Documents") that he wishes his widow to sell the library and collection so that she may "establish thereby a decent and comfortable settlement for the remainder of her life." That George III had the perspicacity to obtain it even before the will was needed, is to his credit today.

As for Smith and Canaletto, Mr. Parker suggests that their relationship was mainly a matter of business. The artist had already established himself by 1720 as a specialist in Venetian topographical painting. Just when Joseph Smith began to purchase his works is not absolutely certain, though by stylistic analysis, the earliest drawing in the collection at Windsor can be ascribed the approximate date of 1727. Since the collection was sold to the Crown in 1763, and Canaletto lived on until 1768, neither the early nor the latest drawings are included in the group. The bulk, Mr. Parker explains, seems to date roughly from the '30's and '40's.

The dating of Canaletto drawings is fraught with difficulties in that the peculiar mannerisms of his line seem to prevail throughout all his drawn works and the art historian must rely in most instances upon topographical rather than stylistic evidence. Hadeln (Detlev von Hadeln, *The Drawings of Canaletto*, London, 1929) lists only eight dated drawings which can serve as criteria.

In the catalogue, the drawings are listed in groups, in some cases according to their relationship to a painted picture or pictures, or to dated or datable drawings. In other cases, they have been grouped according to the places represented, or to the type—such as the series of views of Venetian churches, and the *vedute ideate*—the fanciful views. As has been frequently pointed out, the drawings themselves tend to divide into three classes; those which have the character of a quick sketch, done presumably on the ground; the more elaborate pen drawings in which the artist makes use of cross-hatching for shading; and the drawings in which a

combination of line and wash produce a finished effect that gives evidence that they were conceived and executed as works of art in themselves. The greater majority of the drawings at Windsor certainly fall into the second and third categories.

Canaletto was most at home with the pen, though Mr. Parker points out that one cannot always be sure what type, whether reed, quill or metal, and in every entry in the catalogue, the author gives us the full benefit of the doubt by suggesting whatever possibilities he thinks likely in each case. The ink washes are gray, the line black or brown which may once have been black. From the drawings at Windsor, it can be seen that Canaletto frequently drew first in pencil and occasionally there are touches of red chalk. He used other devices, such as "pin pointing" (plotting the principal points by pricking the paper with a sharp point) and even did not disdain the ruler and dividers and the *camera obscura*. The whole question of the *camera obscura* is not one which Mr. Parker attempts to decide in the relation to the Windsor drawings; he merely suggests that it may have been used in some of the Venetian views where the distance and space are highly exaggerated.

The range of the collection gives us ample chance to perceive the scope of Canaletto's genius. Whether he is picturing the warm sun and water and the assemblage of palaces of Venice or the less flamboyant English scene, he draws with endless variety—carefully drawn architectural orders are contrasted with figures simply and deftly sketched in, delicate delineation is opposed on the same page by bold strokes. Free, idyllic landscapes are beautifully balanced compositions and the precise rendering of light and shade gives the effect of air and atmosphere itself. Only, to my mind, in a few of the group of *vedute ideate*, such as Number 136, does the nervous line seem somewhat stereotyped—what Mr. Parker calls "the mannered style

assoc
Th
clar
con
and
conc
the
is gi
in a
are
estin
Cana
Cana
that
the
the
hard
the
eithe
the

ELIZ
gi
pe
M
is s
trate
phot
and
tails
than
Trap
exha
ing
amp
that
of
the
ture
Chr
sha,
por
lux
Vel
than
His
M
sch
sen

associated with the artist's maturity."

The text is distinguished for its clarity and breadth of the information contained; the catalogue is thoughtfully and thoroughly done. A very helpful concordance of the Windsor numbers, the Hadeln catalogue and this volume is given. The plates have been arranged in a purely topographical order, and they are quite fittingly followed by an interesting map of Venice along the Grand Canal with indications of the scenes Canaletto pictured. Mr. Parker admits that it is a little confusing to arrange the plates in an order which differs from the order of the catalogue, but one could hardly ask for better reproductions of the drawings. All 143 are reproduced, either in the smaller figures throughout the text or in the section of plates.

ELAINE A. EVANS
Fogg Museum of Art
Harvard University

ELIZABETH DU GUÉ TRAPIER, *Velázquez*, 434 p., 251 ill. New York, Hispanic Society, 1948. \$7.50.

Miss Trapier's new book on Velázquez is superbly printed and lavishly illustrated with an emphasis upon large photographs, both of complete pictures and of details. The choice of these details reveals many paintings more fully than ever before in any publication. Miss Trapier's choice of them testifies to her exhaustive knowledge and understanding of her subject. She selects, for example: the hand holding the glove in that unforgettably contemptuous figure of the *Infante Carlos*, the reflection in the mirror in the *Rokeby Venus*, the picture on the wall in the background of *Christ in the House of Mary and Martha*, the hand holding the paper in the portrait of *Innocent X*, etc. In spite of a luxurious format the new monograph on Velázquez is offered at a modest price, thanks to a generous subsidy by the Hispanic Society of America.

Miss Trapier employs a thorough, scholarly, historical method. She presents the opinions of all leading scholars

on every problem and in regard to virtually every picture which she discusses. She is extremely cautious in the conclusions she draws to the extent that the *Christ and the Pilgrims at Emmaus* in the Metropolitan Museum is labelled "attributed to Velázquez," although she states in the text that the authorship of the picture has never been questioned.

In attacking the problem of the possible influence of Caravaggio upon Velázquez in his youthful Sevillian period, she points out the fact that there is no proof that Velázquez had seen any work by the Italian master when he painted the *Epiphany* of 1619. The genre pictures, known as *bodegones*, she believes are an expression of the picaresque, just as in the celebrated novels of the day. On this point she disagrees, as do I, with Ainaud's theory that Velázquez's *bodegones* are directly dependent upon Caravaggio both in style and subject matter.¹

Recently attempts have been made to prove that Velázquez borrowed most of his compositions, individual figures, and even the position of a single hand from Michelangelo, Dürer, Rubens, and obscure prints. To be sure, he like all other masters was subject to artistic influence of his predecessors and his contemporaries. No one will doubt, for instance, that the posture of the woman at the right in *Las Hilanderas* was suggested by one of the nude youths in the Sistine vault.² In her appraisal of the numerous proposed borrowings of Velázquez, Miss Trapier displays balanced judgment. In many cases these so-called borrowings seem to be mere coincidences or even general characteristics of European art in the baroque period.

Miss Trapier and the Hispanic Society are to be congratulated upon a publica-

¹ Ainaud, J., "Ribalta y Caravaggio," *Anales y boletín de los museos de arte de Barcelona*, V (1947), pp. 405-410.

² Angulo Iñiguez, Diego, *Velázquez, como compuso sus principales cuadros*, Sevilla, 1947, figs. 14-15.

tion which is both beautiful in appearance and scholarly in content.

HAROLD E. WETHEY
University of Michigan

ROBERT C. SMITH and ELIZABETH WILDER, *A Guide to the Art of Latin America*, v + 480 p. Washington, Hispanic Foundation, The Library of Congress, 1948. \$1.50.

This work supplements the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, carrying the bibliography for art studies back from 1942, the year in which an art section began to appear in the annual volumes of the *Handbook*. The only major omission is the art of the Spanish-speaking regions of the United States. Puerto Rico is included, but not California, Arizona, or New Mexico. Minor omissions pertain mainly to the dispersed publications of some authors, such as Rafael García Granados of Mexico. Father Rubén Vargas Ugarte of Peru is not mentioned. Such omissions in no way diminish the value of the book. Nothing like it exists, and the student may easily add his own finds to an interleaved copy. The introductory essay of thirty-eight pages will orient the beginner and the expert alike. The critical listings of 4896 items are classified by Colonial, Nineteenth-Century, and Contemporary periods, in sections for each of the current political divisions of Latin America. The index, by authors, artists, and governmental publishers, covers twenty-five pages. The editors have also indicated a library for each of the titles listed.

The nineteenth-century section is covered by only 759 items, or 17% of the total. Publication since 1942 would show a far higher percentage, with the abundant work done in many republics upon the nineteenth-century sources of contemporary style, and upon the genesis of the various national traditions.

Study of the *Guide* should be complemented by a group of essays defining the main problems of Latin American art. Edited by Elizabeth Wilder, it is entitled *Studies in Latin American Art, Proceedings of A Conference Held in*

the Museum of Modern Art, New York, 28-31 May 1945, Washington, 1949, The American Council of Learned Societies, GEORGE KUBLER
Yale University

HAROLD E. WETHEY, *Colonial Architecture and Sculpture in Peru*, xvii + 330 p., 367 ill. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1949. \$12.50.

Chapter I, "The Evolution of Colonial Art in Peru," briefly characterizes the human equipment; reviews and defines the necessary terms of discussion; and rapidly sketches the typology of plan, structure, and effect in the religious architecture of colonial Peru. Nine pages in Chapter II isolate and describe the sixteenth-century churches, few in number and badly preserved. The seventeenth century, typified by the churches in the region of Cuzco, is given twenty-nine pages. This third chapter marks the end of the chronological treatment, and the beginning of an analysis by geographical types that occupies the remainder of the work, in chapters devoted to Lima, and to central, northern, and southern Peru. In some sixty-five pages, three final chapters take up sculpture, under the rubrics of choir stalls, pulpits, and retables. An Appendix, "Catalogue of Monuments in Lima," codifies the descriptions and the bibliography of fifty-two churches.

Throughout, Dr. Wethey's method is rigorous. Chronological discussions and identifications of authorship are based upon sources, of which the unpublished items are often the discoveries of Dr. Wethey. Repeatedly the text provides the first exact description of monuments known otherwise only by name. Field work, archive studies, and wide travel inform every page.

It is proper in pioneering work to hold the number of variable unknowns to an arbitrary minimum, in order to concentrate upon the solutions to well defined problems. This Dr. Wethey has done by restricting his attention in the main to religious architecture and sculpture; by focussing upon stylistic connec-

tions with European art; and by refusing to dip for monuments below a certain threshold of formal complexity and technical permanence. This threshold appears to be taken at the lower limits of durability or permanence in the "creole or *mestizo* style," at the zone dividing rural chapels of simple technique and sparse ornament, from the urban churches of durable construction. It is also taken at the division between ecclesiastical and secular architecture, for few houses and public buildings are discussed in detail. The latter would entail altogether unmanageable problems for the scope of one volume: problems involving cane-and-adobe (*quincha*) construction; the overhanging fenestration of the Peruvian towns; lock-truss wooden roofing; the role of metal ornament; the ventilator-window (*ventana teatina*); the one-story dwelling plan with its almost ritual zoning; the confluence of indoor-outdoor space; the relation of ornament to the distance of the observer, and so on.¹

¹ See "Observaciones sobre la arquitectura actual en Lima," *Las Moradas* (Lima), III, 1949, No. 6.

I would rather Dr. Wethey had inserted the word "religious" or "ecclesiastical" in his title, for the book intentionally says little about secular architecture. The Quinta Presa, an extraordinary manifestation of Peruvian qualities of style, is nowhere mentioned, and the domestic architecture of the Coast is treated as if it were one undifferentiated idiom.

Dr. Wethey in any case has defined the touchstones of value for the ecclesiastical world of Peru with rigor and in detail. I now wish for a book that would begin from the bottom of the scale of complexity and durability and artistic personality, to work up to the zone touched by Dr. Wethey in his downward progress from the altitudes of Peninsular style. In the meantime, Dr. Wethey has given teacher, student, and traveler one of the books most needed, a book without which the other problems cannot be successfully solved. It is clear, exact, detailed, and agreeable to use. It deserves to become part of the basic currency of regional readings in the history of art.

GEORGE KUBLER
Yale University

books received

Altena, J. Q. Van Regteren. *Dutch Master Drawings of the 17th Century*, 29 p., 59 pl. New York: Harper, 1949.

Art Prices Current, Vol. XXV, Parts ABCD, 689 p. London: Art Trade Press, 1949. £7.7s.0.

Art Work in Germany: A Catalogue of an exhibition of the work of 117 contemporary German artists assembled under the direction of Stefan P. Munsing, 42 p., 24 ill. Cultural Affairs Branch OMGB.

Bethers, Ray. *Composition in Pictures*, 244 p., 225 ill. New York: Pitman, 1949. \$5.00.

Bischoff, Ilse. *Proud Heritage*, 279 p. New York: Coward-McCann, 1949. \$3.00.

Blake, Peter. *Marcel Breuer: Architect and Designer*, 128 p., 196 ill. New York: Architectural Record, 1949. \$4.00.

Bodkin, Thomas. *Flemish Paintings*, 24 p., 10 color pl. "The Pitman Gallery"; New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.95.

Bodkin, Thomas. *The Virgin and Child*, 24 p., 10 color pl. "The Pitman Gallery"; New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.95.

Bradbury, C. E. *Anatomy and Construction of the Human Figure*, 198 p., 43 pl., many text ill. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. \$7.50.

Brod, Fritz. *Decorative Design*, 38 p. New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.00.

Cannon, N. I. *Pattern and Design*, 160 p., 200 ill., 20 pl. New York: Pitman, 1948. \$6.00.

Carrington, Noel. *Life in an English Village*, 31 p., 6 drawings, 16 lithographs. London: Penguin Books, 1949. \$.90.

Catalogue of Paintings and Drawings in Water Color, 309 p., 104 pl. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1949. \$4.50.

Cooper, Douglas. *Paul Klee*, 15 p., 32 pl. London: Penguin Books, 1949. \$.90.

Doerner, Max. *The Materials of the Artist and Their Use in Painting*, tr. Eugen Neuhaus, 435 p., 8 pl. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949. \$4.50.

Evans, Ralph M. *An Introduction to Color*, 340 p., 304 ill. New York: John Wiley, 1949. \$6.00.

An Exhibition for Modern Living. A. H. Girard and W. D. Laurie, Jr. Intro. by E. P. Richardson; articles by John Kouwehoven and Edgar Kaufman. Detroit: Detroit Institute of Art, 1949.

Faulkner, R., Ziegfeld, E., and Hill, E. *Art Today*, 519 p., 299 ill. New York: Henry Holt, 1949. \$4.75.

Flemish Drawings, 18 p., 80 pl. New York: Macmillan, Hyperion Press, 1949. \$2.50.

Friedlander, Max. *Landscape, Portrait, Still-Life: Origin and Development*, 284 p., 41 pl. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$6.00.

Garland, Leon. *Ten Color Reproductions of His Paintings*, 4 p., 10 pl. in color. Chicago: Leon Garland Foundation, 1948. \$6.00.

Gide, André. *Notes on Chopin*, tr. Bernard Frechtman, 126 p. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$3.75.

Hayter, Stanley William. *New Ways of Gravure*, 275 p., 100 ill., 25 diagrams, 4 color pl. New York: Pantheon Books, 1949. \$5.50.

Hitchcock, Henry-Russell. *Painting toward Architecture*, foreword by Alfred H. Barr, Jr., 60 p., 40 ill., 24 color pl. New York: Duell, Sloane and Pearce, 1948. \$6.00.

Hoke, Elizabeth S. *The Painted Tray and Free Hand Bronzing*, 38 p., text ill. Vol. 29 of Home Craft Series; Plymouth Meeting, Pa.: Mrs. C. Naaman Keyser, 1949. \$1.50.

Hudnut, Joseph. *Architecture and the Spirit of Man*, 301 p. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. \$4.50.

Johnson, Charles. *The Language of Painting*, 276 p., 80 pl. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949. \$6.50.

Journals and Indian Paintings of George Winter, 147 p., 30 pl. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1948. \$12.50.

Kaminski, Edward B. *How to Draw: A Logical Approach*, 90 p., 137 ill. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. \$3.20.

Keynes, Geoffrey. *Blake*, 24 p., 10 color pl. "The Pitman Gallery"; New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.95.

Leibowitz, Rene. *Schoenberg and His School*, tr. Dika Newlin, 305 p. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$4.75.

Lissim, Simon. *Fourteen Plates*: with a text by George Freedley, 54 p., 14 pl. New York: James Hendrickson, 1949.

Littlejohns, J. *Art for All Water Color Series: Fruit*, 24 p., 30 ill., 20 in color. New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.50.

Longhi, Roberto. *Piero della Francesca Frescoes*, 22 p., 14 color pl. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. \$6.50.

Longyear, William. *How to Use Color in Advertising Design, Illustration and Painting*, 40 p., 14 color pl., many ill. New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.95.

Malraux, André. *The Psychology of Art*: Vol. I, "Museum without Walls," 156 p., many ill.; Vol. II, "The Creative Act," 224 p., many ill.; tr. Stuart Gilbert. The Bollingen Series, XXIV. Geneva: Albert Skira, 1949. \$25.00.

Mandi, Geza deV. A. *The Craft of Ceramics*, 143 p., 40 ill., 16 pl. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1949. \$4.75.

Megroz, R. L. *Profile Art*, 131 p., 140 ill., 60 pl. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$7.50.

Ming Blue and White, 154 ill. with notes for each. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum, 1949. \$.50.

Mississippi Panorama, preface by Perry T. Rathbone, 227 p., 347 ill., 5 color pl. St. Louis: City Art Museum, 1949. \$3.50.

Perard, Victor. *How to Draw*, 160 p., many ill. New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.95.

Planck, Max. *Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers*, 192 p. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$3.75.

Price, Matlack. *Advertising and Editorial Layout*, 359 p., many ill. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. \$6.00.

Rathbun, Mary, and Hayes, Bartlett, Jr. *A Layman's Guide to Modern Art*, 100 ill., 17 in color. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. \$4.00.

Read, Herbert. *Art Now*, 144 p., 195 pl., 3 in color. New York: Pitman, 1949. \$6.00.

Read, Herbert. *Klee*, 24 p., 11 pl. "The Pitman Gallery"; New York: Pitman, 1949. \$1.95.

Read, Herbert. *The Meaning of Art*, 191 p., 64 pl. London: Penguin Books, 1949. 2s. 6d.

Runes, Dagobert D. *Letters to My Son*, 92 p. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$2.75.

Salinger, Margaret. *Flowers: The Flower Piece in European Painting*, 27 p., 44 pl., 40 in color. "Painters and Subjects"; New York: Harpers, 1949. \$5.00.

Schwarz, Karl. *Jewish Artists of the 19th and 20th Centuries*, 273 p., 48 pl. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. \$4.75.

Seymour, Charles H., Jr. *Masterpieces of Sculpture in the National Gallery*, intro. by David E. Finley, 184 p., 142 pl. New York: Coward-McCann, 1949. \$9.75.

Slobodkin, Louis. *Sculpture Principles and Practice*, 255 p., 300 ill. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1949. \$5.95.

Soby, James Thrall, and Barr, Alfred H., Jr. *XX Century Italian Art*, 144 p., 133 pl., 5 color pl. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1949. \$3.75.

Spanish Drawings, 19 p., 80 pl. New York: Macmillan, Hyperion Press, 1949. \$2.50.

Sternberg, Harry. *Modern Methods and Materials of Etching*, 146 p., many ill. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. \$4.00.

Stringer, George Eyre. *New Hall Porcelain*, 136 p., 13 plates, 1 in color. London: Rockcliff Publishing Corp., 1949. 42s.

20th Century Art: Arensberg Collection, essays by Katharine Kuh and Daniel Catton Rich, 32 p., 100 ill. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1949. \$1.25.

van Thienen, Frithjof. *Jan Vermeer of Delft*, 24 p., 37 pl., 8 in color. "Masters of Painting"; New York: Harpers, 1949. \$2.50.

Venetian Drawings, 19 p., 78 pl. New York: Macmillan, Hyperion Press, 1949. \$2.50.

Venturi, Lionello. *Botticelli's Nativity*, 16 p., 7 color pl. New York: Harpers, 1949. \$2.50.

Walker, Phoebe Flory, with Short, Dorothy, and O'Hara, Eliot. *Water-color Portraiture*, 143 p., 56 ill., 4 in color. New York: Putnam's, 1949. \$5.50.

Wilenski, R. H. *Modern French Painters*, 424 p., 96 ill., 8 color pl. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949. \$12.00.